

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. III

Autumn Number, 1934

No. 4

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	CHARLES K. GILBERT	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE	JAMES R. JOY	WILBOUR E. SAUNDERS
DORR DIEFENDORF	JOHN W. LANGDALE	FREDERICK K. STAMM

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb	Royal G. Hall	Edwin Lewis
Edgar Sheffield Brightman	Lynn Harold Hough	McIllyar H. Lichliter
Edwin Grant Conklin	Wilbert F. Howard	Halford E. Luccock
Clarence Tucker Craig	Edward H. Kraus	Chester C. McCown
Albert Edward Day	Umphrey Lee	Harris Franklin Rall
Richard Roberts	Luther A. Weigle	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Office of the Ministry.....	John Baillie 483
Translation Difficulties in the Old Testament.....	Theophile James Meek 491
Shadow-Pictures from Japan.....	Fred D. Gealy 507
To-day's Challenge to the Christian Church.....	John McDowell 517
Religion, Democracy and the Changing Social Order.....	Frank A. Horne 530
Thinking in a Shaking World.....	Lynn Harold Hough 542
The Dilemma in Modern Preaching.....	Vergilius Ferm 550
The Reply of the Preacher.....	Joseph Fort Newton 555
Religion versus Superstition.....	Albert E. Avey 559
The Game of Science.....	L. W. Taylor 567
Institution or Movement?.....	Russell Henry Stafford 579
The Soviets Look at Uncle Sam.....	Julius F. Hecker 588
For the Honor of the Church.....	Frederick K. Stamm 599
A Look at the World.....	Frederick W. Norwood 609
A Christian Manifesto.....	Francis J. McConnell 614
Book Reviews.....	619
Bookish Brevities.....	635
Index—Volume III.....	639

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the October, 1934, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

Published by

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Who's Who?

ALBERT E. AVEY, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

JOHN BAILLIE, D.D., Litt.D. Chair of Divinity, Edinburgh University.

VERGILIUS FERM, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy, The College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio.

FRED D. GEALY, Ph.D. Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Aoyama Gakuin School of Theology, Tokyo, Japan.

JULIUS F. HECKER. American minister and author, engaged in special work in Russia.

FRANK A. HORNE, S.C.D. President, Merchants Refrigerating Company, New York City.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH, D.D., Litt.D., LL.D. Dean and Professor of Homiletics and Comprehensive Scholarship, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, D.D., LL.D. Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, resident in New York City.

JOHN MCDOWELL, D.D., LL.D. Secretary of the Committee on Social and Industrial Relations of the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and Moderator of the General Assembly in 1933-4.

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK, B.A., B.D., Ph.D. Professor of Oriental Languages, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

JOSEPH FORT NEWTON, D.D. Rector of Saint James Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D. Minister of The City Temple, London.

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD, D.D., LL.D. Minister of the Old South Church in Boston.

FREDERICK K. STAMM. Minister of the Clinton Avenue Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

L. W. TAYLOR, Ph.D. Professor of Physics, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

Copyright, 1934, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

The Office of the Ministry

JOHN BAILLIE

IT IS not permissible to regard the Christian ministry as just one career among others, or as one profession among others; and this for the same reason which makes it never permissible to regard religion as just one compartment of life among others. Religion is not to be understood as a phase of human culture, an aspect of human self-expression or a subdivision of human philosophy, but only as the confrontation of all life and all culture and all self-expression and all philosophy by the transcendent reality of God. And the office of the Christian minister is simply to be instrumental in bringing about such confrontation within the bounds of the community in which his lot is cast. It is to this end that we are called—to be the appointed instruments whereby the divine challenge shall reach the life of this or that particular town and the hearts and homes of these or those particular men and women. The common sin and shame of our human race is that it lives in forgetfulness of God. To watch the world's life go by, one would think there were no God to be reckoned with and no Christ knocking at the door. Men behave as if he were not there or, what is the same thing, as if they themselves were all there is. They behave as if there were no divine purpose at work in the world, nothing but their own petty and selfish schemes. It is to this situation that the Christian minister must address himself. Unto one end only he must bend all his labors—that the complacent worldliness of men be more and more disrupted, and God's voice heard and obeyed.

Yet it is not as if the minister were sent to a people whose self-sufficient finitude had never yet been disturbed at all. There are no such people. Nor is there in the world any such thing as a purely self-contained human life. We have good authority for holding that "the invisible things of (God) from the creation of the world are clearly seen, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" who behave as if he had never made himself known; and again, and furthermore, that all men everywhere "show the works of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." That is spoken of those outside the Hebrew

and Christian traditions, but we can say much more than that about the men and women to whom most of us are called upon to minister. The Christian gospel has so long been proclaimed in our Western World that something of it has not only reached every ear but has left its mark on every heart. Is there any man or woman in America to-day whose life is quite the same as if Jesus Christ had never been? It is difficult to believe that there is. There may be men who have never even in the least degree *responded* to the challenge of God in Christ, but I doubt if there is anybody who has not in some degree been troubled and stung by it, so that he can never again enjoy complete peace of mind in continuing to live unto himself. Our modern world has an uneasy conscience, and with this uneasiness the Christian gospel has had a great deal to do. That may at first seem a strange statement in view of the amazing smugness and self-satisfied selfishness that pervade so much of our society. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" Yes, it does often seem to be nothing at all. Yet a closer scrutiny will, I think, lead us to distrust this seeming. The surface life of society may appear to be unruffled, but that is only because the disturbances are being forcibly held down in the interior depths of individual minds. On August 18, 1908, Thomas Hardy jotted down this in his diary: "If all hearts were open and all desires known—as they would be if people showed their souls—how many gapings, sighings, clenched fists, knotted brows, broad grins, and red eyes would we see in the market place!" But the psychology of recent years has done us the service of enabling us to look deeper yet, and still more to distrust the unruffled surface of our mental life. Our eyes have been opened to the existence of a still lower submarine depth into which the disturbances may be "repressed." Not only may men's faces belie their thoughts, but likewise their conscious thoughts may belie the "subconscious" workings of their minds. And the psychoanalysts have shown us how essentially dangerous and unstable and even explosive this condition of repressed disturbance after all is, and how the many forms of nervous and mental sickness with which the modern world is harassed are nothing but the revenge taken upon our sham serenity by conflicts which, instead of being courageously faced, were dealt with in this too summary way.

In the light of this closer scrutiny, then, the world's apparent self-containedness and indifference to God's transcendent claim begin to wear a somewhat different look. I do not mean to say that the only conflicts that

are repressed, and whose repression gives rise to morbid symptoms, are conflicts between right and wrong or between one's own will and God's. But it is surprising from how few cases of troubled mental life this moral element seems to be entirely absent. An inferiority complex may, according to the experts, come about through the consciousness of some merely physical disability or deformity, such as a bad stammer, but there can be no doubt that it is the moral deformity of a bad conscience that gives rise to the worst kind of trouble. Indeed it is difficult to believe that physical deformity could of itself have any such sequel in a life steadfastly devoted to the highest moral ends. It is really our sins that make our misfortunes unbearable. ("The sting of death is sin"); just as it is God's grace that can transmute them into instruments of blessing, making sweet the uses of adversity. Other animals are largely or wholly immune from the nervous tensions, the divided selfhood and the conscientious struggles that harass the human soul; man alone can never again rest happily in a purely animal life, because to him has come the knowledge of God—and to the men of this land at least, the knowledge of God in Christ. Dr. Adolf Keller recently quoted the celebrated Swiss psychoanalyst, C. G. Jung, as having once said to him that in his analysis of the morbid psychoses of Jews he was constantly finding one element to be resistance to the cross. If this be true even of Jews who have the established authority of their religion behind them in resisting Christ's Cross, how much more must it be true of those in the Christian world who in resisting it are going contrary to their own accepted standards!

The fact is that the typical man of the world is spiritually much more *vulnerable* than he looks. His self-sufficiency is largely on the surface and does not go deep. And here lies the opportunity of the Christian minister, both as preacher and as pastor, if only he have the wisdom and courage to lay hold of it as he ought. I believe that of recent years we have been far too ready to conclude that the modern man has developed an immunity against the appeal of the gospel. We have approached him apologetically. We have made stammering excuses for our intrusion. We have begun our discourse with him on something like his own plane and have hoped gradually to lead him upwards to Christ's level, but it is seldom that we have succeeded in carrying him very far. We have appealed to him perhaps as a business man, as a man of the world or even as a sportsman. Or if he were of the intelligentsia, we have appealed to his interest in science and have

endeavored to persuade him that the concept of God was necessary to the completion of the system of scientific thought. In this way we have often lured him into some Court of the Gentiles but seldom, I fear, into the Holy of Holies. Perhaps we have made the mistake of arguing with him when we ought to have directly challenged him. We have disputed with him about God's existence when we ought to have confronted him with God's commandments. And we have justified ourselves by saying that the day of the old dogmatic preaching was over. But have we not now begun to wonder whether the day of the new apologetic preaching is not passing away in its turn? Are we not awakening to the weakness of this supposedly improved strategy and beginning to wonder whether the old frontal attack were not after all the sounder method? Actually, it would seem to be those recent movements which have returned to such frontal attack and have preached the gospel in its fullness and without apology, that have of recent years been most successful in disturbing men's complacency.

The Barthian and Buchman movements are both portentous in this regard, though I am by no means thinking of them alone. The representatives of such movements will seldom consent to argue with men about God or about his commandments or about his revelation of himself in Christ. To us this refusal is likely to appear as mere obscurantism; not to argue, we say, is not to think. And indeed it is difficult to avoid the impression of a certain false anti-intellectualism, a certain despair of thought, in some of these newer voices of our day. Such men pray indeed with the spirit, but do they always pray with the understanding also? The Christian ages have been characterized by a long and arduous labor of thought, and we must on no account allow ourselves to be robbed of any part of this rich heritage—not even in the name of a returning spirituality. Yet are we really right in our contention that not to argue is not to think? I believe that in this we go too far. For not all thought is discursive. Not all propositions are to be proved by appeal to prior premises, for that could only land us in the fallacy of an infinite regress. You cannot build a wall by trying to lay each brick on the top of another brick, and none at all on the ground. There must be some element of immediacy in our thinking. There must be some reality by which we are directly confronted—some reality which we know, not because we know something else first, but rather as itself the ground of all reliable knowledge of other things.

What is this reality? Descartes, at the beginning of the modern

period, thought it was himself; the prime certainty to him was the existence of René Descartes. The naïve naturalism of common sense would say that it was the material world. Dr. Samuel Johnson, that prodigy of common sense in an age of common sense, thought that in order to refute Berkeley's idealism, he did not need to *prove* the existence of such material things as rocks and stones—it were enough to bump the doubter's head against one, meeting him in this way not with argument but with direct confrontation. Perhaps we should not think too hardly of such naïve materialism, when we remember how recently (if the biologists are right) we have sprung from the race of monkeys whose one standard of reality was the solid material branch to which they clung. Descartes' humanistic starting-point was no doubt a great advance on such naturalism, but I believe men are now growing very suspicious of it, and very weary of it, more and more haunted by the fear of its solipsism. And so perhaps we are ready for a return to the ancient doctrine that the one reality which cannot be established by argument, the one reality which immediately confronts us, so that instead of pretending to prove it we must rather give up our attempts to evade it, is God. This is why a thinker like Brunner can say that "next to the foolishness of denying God, certainly the greatest is that of proving him." For in seeking to prove that anything exists, we are attempting to derive its reality from some other reality that is more directly known to us; and when we seek to prove to men that God exists, we are encouraging in them the idea that something else is more directly known to them than God, something more challenging than his presence, something more urgent than their obedience to his commands, something plainer in its evidence than the duty he has laid before their feet. Yet that, surely, is the very opposite of the effect which it is really our office to produce.

If, however, we do take seriously this conception of God as the most immediately challenging of all realities, we must recognize the very far-going rethinking of the thoughts of the past which it is likely to involve. In his book on *Science and the Modern World* Professor Whitehead complains that "for over two centuries religion has been on the defensive, and on a weak defensive." "The religious controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," he goes on, "put theologians into a most unfortunate state of mind. They were always attacking and defending. They pictured themselves as the garrison of a fort surrounded by hostile forces." And a few pages further on he lays it down that "*religion collapses unless its main*

positions command immediacy of assent." That seems to me to be exactly the point. Our whole priestly task vanishes in the moment when we cease to be able to speak to men in the name of God and begin merely to argue in favor of our own opinions. And this is why it will avail us but little to fall back upon the old dogmatic positions in anything like their traditional form. For to "command immediacy of assent" is just what the old dogmatic formulæ are never again likely to do. Once upon a time they may have been challenging to all, but now there are many to whom they are only puzzling. I conceive it, then, to be the great task of the theology of the future so to reformulate the great dogmas of the Christian faith that the direct and challenging reality of them shall be inescapably and even (in view of our sinful loathness) inconveniently clear. The Christian gospel was never intended to puzzle men; it was intended to convict them; and unless we preach it in a form in which it does convict, we are not preaching it as it was meant to be preached.

Some ten years ago I wrote an article for the *Hibbert Journal* in which I defined religion as consisting of those beliefs, and of those beliefs only, *which it was wicked not to believe*. No doctrine, I argued, had any right to inclusion within our Christian creed, however true it might be, if it could be doubted with a perfectly clear conscience. There might be many doctrines which engaged our merely intellectual assent, but that gave them no right to be called religious doctrines, or to be preached with the authority of divine revelation, unless they engaged also the assent of conscience, that is, unless they convicted us of sin and not merely of error. I should not now express the matter in quite the same way, but I am no less anxious now than I was then to claim for religious doctrine what Whitehead called immediacy of assent.

It is in this way that I have always tried to conceive the task of theology. Our endeavor must be so to put before men the conceptions of Creation, Providence, Incarnation, Trinity and Atonement that instead of challenging their intellects to contradiction they shall challenge their hearts to repentance and to obedience.

Take as a single example the central doctrine of the whole Christian faith—the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ. It was this doctrine, as Matthew Arnold once said (perhaps a little flippantly), that made the fortune of Christianity in the Western world; yet it impresses many people of our time with nothing but bewilderment. They treat it as a fantastic specula-

tion. It does not occur to them that it has any direct bearing on the business of the present hour. But let us reflect on what it means. What we are here doing is linking together two names, those of God and of Jesus Christ. What do these names stand for? Well, whatever else the mysterious name of God stands for, it stands at least for the ultimate reality, the final secret of life and of the world. And Jesus Christ—what does that name mean? Well, it means a life of a very particular kind that was once lived out on this old planet of ours; a life of simplicity, of meekness, of humility and of great unobtrusiveness; a life spent in doing good and in healing all that were oppressed of the devil; a ministering life rather than one that sought to be ministered unto; a life spent for the most part not among the whole but among the sick, and not among righteous men but among publicans and sinners; a life grounded from first to last not on requital but on forgiveness, not on force but on love, not on getting but on giving, not on self-saving but on self-spending; a life that at the last readily gave itself up to death in order that others might live more abundantly. This, then, is the very least we are doing when we make bold to affirm the Godhead of Christ—we are affirming our belief that *that* kind of life is the life divine. We are committing ourselves to the declaration that in *that* kind of life lies the final secret of the universe. We are taking our stand upon the solemn assertion that the things this Man of Nazareth stood for are the most real things in all the world. We are embracing the faith that love is absolute and that the Absolute is love.

Now what commitment could be more exacting, more testing, to men than this one? Ah, did we think that this confession of the Godhead of Christ was a confession that we might lightly take upon our lips? Did we think that when we intoned the words. “. . . And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord,” we were committing ourselves to nothing practical? The truth is rather that no other dogma that has ever been published is so severely, so terribly, practical as this one or makes such inexorable demands on the daily conduct of men’s lives. To confess the Godhead of Christ can never be an easy thing to anybody, and it must not be preached as if it were an easy thing; but I believe it must be preached in such a way as to make men feel that the greatest difficulty of it is not theoretical but practical. The preacher’s challenge, then, must take this form: “Are you prepared so to live that the people around you would know, even without your telling them, that you find in this Christ-life the secret hidden meaning of all that

was and is and ever shall be?" For unless something like *that* be true of a man, then he does not really believe in the Godhead of Christ, no matter what he says with his lips or thinks with the surface of his mind.

One thing more I must not leave unwritten. If it is our office as ministers of the gospel to be instrumental in confronting men with God, we must first make sure that we ourselves have been confronted with him and that this confrontation has borne fruit unto obedience. Before speaking to men of the solemn things of God, we must ask ourselves whether we have a right to speak. There is no other evil mixture that smells so rank to heaven and at the same time so offends the nostrils of men as hypocritical religion. The contrast between Christian preaching and Christian practice has been without exception the greatest handicap with which Christianity has had to reckon during all the centuries of its history. The world is quick to detect the least flaw of insincerity in all solemn discourse; for, with all its faults, the world does know the difference between conviction and cant. Cant is a hard word, I know, but it is the only proper name for all talk about God spoken otherwise than in direct confrontation with God himself. "What this parish needs," said Thomas Carlyle to the new minister of Craigenputtock, "is a man who knows God otherwise than by hearsay." And it is what every parish needs. There is one scripture text which has often seemed to me to be the minister's own text more than any other, and on which we would do well to meditate daily. It is the word ascribed to Christ by Saint John, "For their sakes I sanctify myself." Even Christ had to remind himself that his ministry to men could not bear proper fruit unless he first saw to it that his own life was holy! If then Christ made himself more holy for our sakes, shall we not make ourselves more holy for the sake of those to whom we are sent in his name?

And yet, if we still feel ourselves to be unworthy, as we are sure to do, we must not allow ourselves to be unduly discouraged. For it is in God's strength that we are to go forward and not in our own; and clothed in God's righteousness rather than in our own. Earthen vessels as we are, God can still use us for his high ends. Many a poor sermon has been the means of an excellent conversion. Many a weaker brother has been the schoolmaster of saints. If we put our trust in God alone, he will fill up our deficiency from his own inexhaustible store.

Translation Difficulties in the Old Testament¹

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK

AT first sight the preparation of a translation of the Old Testament in this advanced age would seem to be a comparatively easy task. So many translations have already been made and the ground has been so thoroughly worked by the patient exegetical labors of hundreds of scholars that the task would seem to be little more than the gathering together of the results. But the problem is infinitely greater than that. The ideal translator must not only know what others have done before him, but he must himself have a perfect knowledge of the original; he must be able to put himself into complete sympathy with the point of view of the author that he is translating; and he must be a master of the language into which he is rendering the original documents. No man, of course, can fully attain to this ideal, and venturesome indeed is he who would essay the task. He has undertaken the impossible. But man has always been attempting the impossible, and each endeavor, with all its failures, has been a stepping-stone to a better effort. None can attain perfection, but each can add his mite to the ultimate attainment of what in the end may at least approximate perfection.

The first difficulty facing the translator of the Old Testament is the language, or rather the languages (Hebrew and Aramaic), in which it is written. Like the people who spoke it, the Hebrew language is a complex of many elements. We know now that the Hebrews throughout the long range of their history were affected by many different cultures,² and in their ethnic composition they were a conglomerate of many different stocks, all of which is apparent in their language. Hebrew is full of loan words from other languages, and its grammar and syntax are often explicable only by reference to other tongues. In fact, it is only with a knowledge of the languages of all the peoples with whom the Hebrews came into contact

¹ This article has grown out of the writer's labors on *The Bible: An American Translation*, edited by Smith and Goodspeed.

² See the writer's article, "The Interpenetration of Cultures as Illustrated by the Old Testament Literature," *Journal of Religion*, VII, 244ff.

that one can fully understand their language and accurately translate it. Many a rare word or construction finds easy explanation when referred to the language from which it came into Hebrew, and if difficulties remain, as they do, it is because our knowledge is as yet insufficient to refer them to their proper source. But in this field much progress has been made of late,^a which gives the modern translator a tremendous advantage over his predecessors. A few examples will illustrate this. The word *hānîk*, Genesis 14. 14, has lately been found in the Akkadian vocabularies from Boghaz-köi, and means "retainer." Genesis 41. 34^b has been universally translated, "Let him take the fifth part of the land of Egypt," but this is manifestly wrong, as the next verse clearly shows. The word *hāmasā*, that is used here, appears as a noun in Joshua 1. 14; 4. 12; Judges 7. 11, and is identical with the Arabic *hamasa*, which means "to fortify, forearm." In the Genesis passage Joseph is advising Pharaoh to store up food during the years of plenty to put the land in a state of security against the years of famine to follow. The root *hālaš* is found rather often in the Old Testament. It has ordinarily been translated "to arm," but comparison with its Arabic cognate shows that the meaning is "to select the best." Hence Numbers 31. 3f. should be translated, "Choose the best of your number as an army to serve against Median, to execute Yahweh's vengeance on Median, selecting for the army a thousand from each of all the tribes of Israel." For the same reason the participial noun *hālûš* in Numbers 31. 5; 32. 21; Deuteronomy 3. 18; Joshua 4. 13; 6. 7, 9, 13, and elsewhere, is to be translated "picked troops," instead of "armed," as regularly rendered. Ezekiel 39. 2a has ordinarily been translated, "I will turn you about and lead you on;" but comparison with the Ethiopic *sōsawa* shows that we are to translate, "I will turn you about and bring you in." In 2 Kings 17. 9a occurs the hapaxlegomenon *hāpâ*, which we know now to be cognate with Akkadian (Assyro-Babylonian) *hapû*, "to utter," and thus the rendering of the Targums and the Syriac as against the ordinary but impossible "impute" is vindicated: "The Israelites uttered words that were not true against Yahweh, their God." In Lamentations 2. 1 appears a verb identical with Arabic *ʿāba*, and so the verse is to be translated, "How the Lord has disgraced the daughter of Zion in his anger!" One of the striking features

^aThe best single contribution in this field is Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, in seven large volumes. See also G. R. Driver's articles in the *Journal of Theological Studies* and elsewhere. Some of the illustrations used in this article are drawn from these writers.

of the Song of Songs is the unusually large number of hapaxlegomena, whose meanings in most cases have heretofore only been guessed at. In recent studies it has been discovered that a number of these can be referred to Akkadian cognates,⁴ and their true meanings in this way can be determined. The same is true of a host of words in Hebrew, but it is not always easy to discover the cognate, and therein lies one of the difficulties of the translator.

It is not only in the field of vocabulary, but in that of grammar and syntax as well, that light can be obtained from other languages, of which two illustrations may be given. In Akkadian and Arabic the noun is found with case endings, but in Hebrew these have almost completely disappeared. They survive occasionally, however, but this has not always been recognized. Hence even the English and American revisions read both "Ephrath" (for example, Genesis 35. 16; 48. 7) and "Ephrathah" (for example, Ruth 4. 11; Micah 5. 2), whereas, of course, the first form is the only correct spelling. In the second we have the addition of the oblique case ending *â*. Similarly, Gudgodah (Deuteronomy 10. 7) should be Gudgod, Jotbathah (Numbers 33. 33f.; Deuteronomy 10. 7; 2 Kings 21. 19) should be Jotbah; and *šôrêqâ* in Genesis 49. 11 is not a hapaxlegomenon, as generally supposed, but the word *šôrêq* with the oblique case ending after the preposition "to." A common construction in Arabic is the so-called *hal*-clause, which, as the name suggests, expresses the state, condition, or manner in which the action of the main clause takes place. This kind of clause has not been recognized in Hebrew until recently,⁵ but it appears there with great frequency, and is used both with and without the conjunctive *waw*, just as it is in Arabic and Akkadian. The proof of its existence in Hebrew is well demonstrated by Joshua 11, where the infinitive absolute of verse 11, the regular Hebrew construction to express a subordinate adverbial clause, appears as a finite verb in verse 12, to make a co-ordinate adverbial clause or *hal*-clause. Scholars have universally regarded the text in verse 12 as incorrect and have revocalized the verb to make it read as an infinitive absolute, but this is a purely arbitrary emendation and is absolutely unwarranted. The writer in these two verses is

⁴ See the present writer, "Canticles and the Tammuz Cult," *AJSL*, XXXIX, 1-14; "Babylonian Parallels to the Song of Songs," *JBL*, XLIII, 245-52; "The Song of Songs and the Fertility Cult," in *The Song of Songs: A Symposium*, ed. W. H. Schoff.

⁵ See the writer's articles, "The Co-ordinate Adverbial Clause in Hebrew," *JAOS*, XLIX, 156ff.; *AJSL*, XLVII, 51ff.

simply using two different constructions to express the same idea. Another evidence of the existence of the *hal*-clause is found when we compare the clause, "I am Yahweh, your God," in Leviticus 19. 4 and elsewhere, with its variant in Leviticus 24. 22, "for I am Yahweh, your God." In Leviticus 19. 4 the clause is a *hal*-clause and hence should be translated, "since I am Yahweh, your God." Once the construction is recognized, it is seen to appear very often in the Old Testament, and its accurate reproduction in English makes a translation quite different from the accepted versions, as a few examples will show: "Search was made, beginning with the oldest and ending with the youngest"⁶ (Genesis 44. 12); "You have acted foolishly in that you have not kept the command of Yahweh, your God"⁶ (1 Samuel 13. 13); "So he remained there with Yahweh for forty days and nights, without eating bread or drinking water" (Exodus 34. 28); "I found that you had indeed sinned against Yahweh, your God, by making yourselves a molten bull, having quickly swerved from the path that Yahweh had appointed you" (Deuteronomy 9. 16); "Only be very strong and resolute to be careful to do just as my servant Moses commanded you, swerving therefrom neither to the right nor to the left, so that you may succeed in everything that you undertake" (Joshua 1. 7); "So Joshua made a surprise attack on them, having marched all night from Gilgal" (Joshua 10. 9); "You are to eat it just as you would a gazelle or a deer, the unclean and the clean eating it together" (Deuteronomy 12. 22). To the extent that the translator fails to recognize these *hal*-clauses, to that extent he fails to do justice to the Hebrew. They are not to be translated as independent clauses, as is universally done, but as subordinate clauses, since that is their equivalent in English. As all scholars know, Hebrew and the other Semitic languages differ from English in expressing logical subordination ordinarily by grammatical co-ordination.⁷

Another source of information to assist the translator in his work is archæology. If the cognate languages fail to throw light on a difficult word, one may find what he is seeking in the finds of the excavator, as has lately been strikingly illustrated. The discovery of the hitherto unknown Hebrew weight, the *pim* (two-thirds of a shekel), has made it possible to translate 1 Samuel 13. 21 with good sense: "The price of the filing was

⁶To change the text in these two passages, as practically all scholars do, is quite unnecessary when one recognizes the construction.

⁷We occasionally get this construction in English, for example, in such a sentence as "Delete the article, and the clause reads smoothly."

a pim for the mattocks, for the coulter, for the three-tined forks, and for the axes, and for setting the goads."⁸

One of the trials of the translator is the corrupt state of the Hebrew text in many passages. When we remember that one of the oldest Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament is dated 916 A. D., and that many centuries of copying bridge the gap between the Hebrew as originally written and our oldest manuscripts, it is not surprising that mistakes have crept into the text. The wonder is that there are not more of them. Some of these textual errors may be corrected by reference to the ancient Versions, like the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Samaritan, the Syriac, and the Septuagint, with its recensions. For instance, the last phrase in Song of Songs 7. 10, "stirring the lips of the sleepers," makes absolutely no sense, but reference to the Versions shows that several of them had a slightly different text, which makes good sense: "stirring my lips and teeth." The last word in Joshua 15. 28 is untranslatable as it stands, but when corrected by the Septuagint and the parallel in Nehemiah 11. 27 it reads, "with its dependencies." In Numbers 32. 17 the third word has accidentally lost one letter and hence cannot be translated, but the Septuagint and Vulgate have fortunately preserved the original for us, *hāmūšim* for the impossible *hūšim*.

Sometimes the scribe accidentally omitted a word or occasionally a whole line, as, for example, in 1 Samuel 14. 41, where all the words after the first "Israel" fell out as far as the third "Israel," all of which appears in the Versions and are necessary to the sense. Hence the verse should read: "Then Saul said to Yahweh, the God of Israel, 'Why hast thou not answered thy servant to-day? If the sin lies in me or in my son Jonathan, then, O Yahweh, God of Israel, let the lot be Urim; but if the sin lies in thy people Israel, let the lot be Thummim.'" The translator must be on the watch for such passages and introduce them when necessary.

Rather often it is apparent that additions have crept into the Hebrew text which destroy the meaning. It may be a single letter or a word or a long phrase, as in Joshua 8. 14, where comparison with the Septuagint shows that the original was, "As soon as the king of Ai became aware of it, he hurried out with all his people to meet Israel in battle, without knowing that there was an ambush for him west of the city." Sometimes the Hebrew has a phrase or a whole clause misplaced. In Genesis 1, for example, the phrase, "and so it was," which should come at the end of verse 6, is found

⁸ Moffatt failed to note this discovery when making his translation and left the passage blank.

at the end of verse 7, where it does not make sense. The Septuagint has the phrase in its proper position.

In many cases, however, the Versions render no assistance and one has to have recourse to speculation, but speculation scientifically controlled. Comparison of the Hebrew with the Versions has shown the kinds of mistakes that occurred in the transcription of the text, and on the basis of the study of these certain principles can be established. Sometimes the scribe accidentally repeated a phrase or a letter, or wrote it only once when he should have written it twice. For example, in Ecclesiastes 5. 9 the ungrammatical construction of the second clause is easily corrected by the deletion of the letter *b*, which is due to dittography. In Genesis 4. 1*b* the accepted translation is quite impossible; for one reason, because it gives to the Hebrew word for man, *'is* or *'ish* (always an adult man), a meaning which it cannot possibly have. The insertion of one letter after the preposition "with," dropped by haplography, clears up the whole situation: "Then she said, 'I have won back my husband; Yahweh is with me.'" Similarly, at the end of verse 13 in Genesis 6 the senseless phrase, "I will destroy them with the earth," gives excellent sense when the letter *m*, accidentally dropped, has been restored: "I will destroy them from the earth." And so in numerous instances.

Another kind of scribal error that the translator must have in mind is the transposition of letters. A good example is the Hebrew word for "together" in Deuteronomy 33. 17. As it stands, the word does not give sense to the passage, whereas a slight rearrangement of the consonants (*wydh* for *yhdw*) gives us a word that sense and meter both require: "That he may butt the nations with them, and drive them to the ends of the earth." Exodus 5. 9, as it stands, is quite ungrammatical, and the trouble is due simply to the fact that one word has two letters transposed, as the Versions indicate. With this correction the verse reads quite smoothly: "Let heavy work be loaded on them, that they may give attention to it and not to lying words." Sometimes the evidence of the transposition of letters is found in the Old Testament itself; for Timnath-serah of Joshua 19. 50; 24. 30 appears in Judges 2. 9 as Timnath-heres, of which only one can be right, probably the latter.

Another kind of error arose from the confusion and interchange of consonants, due to the similarity of form either in the old script or in the new, or due to the similarity of sound. As an instance of the latter, the

prepositions "to" and "upon" in Hebrew are very similar in sound and are frequently interchanged, showing that the scribe wrote at times from dictation. Another good example is the word *mētā'ēb* in Amos 6. 8. There is no such root as *tā'ab*, "to abhor," and what the scribe should have written is *mētā'ēb*. He thought that it was an 'aleph that was pronounced by his reader, whereas it was really an 'ayin. Other mistakes arose when the scribe copied from sight. A number of the Hebrew letters are so similar in form that they were frequently confused, as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings 24. 1 and elsewhere) and Nebuchadrezzar (Jeremiah 21. 2 and elsewhere), the latter of which is the correct spelling. In Judges 6. 4b the Massoretic text runs, "So they would leave nothing in Israel to live on, neither sheep nor oxen nor asses;" but whoever heard of asses being used for food? Change the letter *waw*, immediately preceding the word for "sheep," to *lamedh*, and we get good sense: "So they would leave nothing in Israel for the sheep, oxen, and asses to live on." Exodus 2. 25, as it stands, does not fit well into its context, but with the change of one consonant (*ōmî* for *bēnê*) we get what was manifestly the original: "God saw the plight of Israel, and took cognizance of it." Sometimes the scribe saw his mistake in time to correct it, but left both the error and the correction in the text, because he did not want to spoil the appearance of the page by erasures. A good example is Deuteronomy 32. 5, where the scribe first wrote incorrectly *lô*, "to him," and then corrected it to *lô*, "not." Delete the first and the passage gives good sense: "Their imperfection has been the undoing of those undutiful to him" (literally "of those not his children"). Another example is the letter *he* at the end of *wēniqlâh*, Deuteronomy 25. 3, which the scribe corrected to *aleph*, immediately following, or there may have been dittography here. As the text stands, it makes no sense, but when the incorrect *he* is deleted,⁹ the sense intended is immediately restored: "He may be given forty lashes, but not more, lest in being given more than that number your fellow-countrymen should be cut to ribbons before your eyes."

Ancient scribes, like modern, rather frequently introduced abbreviations into their writing, and the translator must watch carefully for these. For example, *lî* in Deuteronomy 32. 25 is strictly not "to me," or "mine," as it is ordinarily translated, but it is an abbreviation for *lēyôm*, "against the day," as the parallelism with "against the time" shows. This is con-

⁹ Reading *wēnuqqal*, from the root *nāqal*, Arabic *naqala*.

firmed by the reading of two important Versions, the Septuagint and the Samaritan.

The Hebrew text of the Old Testament was originally written with consonants only, undivided into words. It was not vocalized until the seventh century A. D., long after Hebrew had ceased to be a spoken language. Hence a large number of the errors in our present Hebrew text (the Massoretic text) can be traced to the imperfect knowledge of the Massorettes, who frequently made wrong divisions of the consonants into words, or incorrectly vocalized them. Rather often one or more of the Versions indicate the correct reading; at other times the translator has to discover the mistake for himself. In Amos 6. 12, for example, if we follow the Massoretic text, we have to translate, "Do horses run on rocks, or does one plow with oxen?" But this is inappropriate and makes the Hebrew word for "oxen" plural, which occurs nowhere else. By dividing the last word into two words we get the original: "Do horses run on rocks, or does one plow the sea with oxen?" In Genesis 49. 20 the Massoretic text has an impossible construction, due to the fact that it has carried over to the first word the letter *m* which belongs to the last word of the preceding verse. The Versions have the words correctly divided. In Genesis 41. 40, as the text is vocalized, the only possible rendering is, "You shall be in charge of my palace, and all my people shall kiss unto your mouth," which is nonsense, whereas a slightly different vocalization of the word translated "kiss"¹⁰ gives good sense: "You shall be in charge of my palace, and all my people shall be obedient to your commands" (literally, "to your mouth"). Genesis 41. 56 reads, "The famine spread over the whole land; so Joseph threw open all that was in them, and sold grain to the Egyptians." But "them" has no antecedent and is meaningless. A different vocalization gives us *bāham* instead of *bāhem*: "So Joseph threw open all that he had locked up," that is, all his stores. In Numbers 8. 16 the text as vocalized reads, "For they have been assigned, they have been assigned to me." Vocalize the second word as *nēlīnūm*, and we get good sense: "For they have been assigned to me as servants." If we follow the Massoretic text in Genesis 27. 19^b, we get the very foolish statement, "Now sit up, sit down and eat of my game, that you may give me your blessing;" but a slight change in the vocalization of one word (*šûbâ* for *šēbâ*) gives, "Now sit up and eat once more of my game, that you may give me your blessing."

¹⁰ Reading *yānūq*, from the root *lūq*, Arabic, *lūqa*.

Joshua 22. 19^b is quite ungrammatical as it stands; repoint the second verb as a Hiphil and the text becomes regular: "Do not rebel against Yahweh, nor implicate us, by building another altar besides the altar of Yahweh, our God." A word that has always been a crux to scholars is the verb at the end of Judges 3. 22. No one seems to have thought of vocalizing it as a Hiphil, but to do so immediately clears up the difficulty: "And the fat closed over the blade; for he did not draw the dagger out of his abdomen, but let it go into the hole."

At times the emendation is rather complex. Mistakes of various kinds have been made, so that more than one letter is affected, and sometimes more than one word. Deuteronomy 11. 2 is an example. As it stands, the verse is untranslatable. Most scholars arbitrarily insert the verb "speak" in the second clause, but a more scientific emendation is to vocalize the first word as a Piel (cf. Job 38. 12), change *hayyôm* to *'ôthām*, and delete the two particles that follow: "You must teach them to your children, who have not known or experienced the discipline of Yahweh, your God, his greatness, his strong hand and outstretched arm." Another good illustration is Jeremiah 1. 13-15*a*, which with a few necessary changes reads:

"The word of Yahweh came to me a second time: 'What do you see?'

Whereupon I said,

'A pot blown upon I see,
and its blower is from the north.'

Then Yahweh said to me,

'Out of the north evil is about to be blown
upon all the inhabitants of the earth;

For see, I am summoning
all the kings of the earth.'

It is the oracle of Yahweh."¹¹

The ordinary reading of this passage gives a pot a face, which is impossible, and it fails to bring out the paranomasia of the original.

Another kind of error that is found is due to the fact that the scribe, not unconsciously, but consciously, made changes in the text. Sometimes the error arose through prejudice, as, for instance, in Deuteronomy 27. 4 and Joshua 8. 30, where "Gerizim" was changed to "Ebal" out of hatred of the Samaritans and their sanctuary at Gerizim. Sometimes it is due to the extreme anthropomorphism of the original, which was repulsive to a

¹¹ For the justification of this reading see the writer's article, "The Poetry of Jeremiah," *JQR*, XVI, 285f.

later generation. Hence the frequent expression, "to see the face of God," always has its vowels arbitrarily changed to produce what is strictly an anomaly in Hebrew, but is intended to mean, "to appear before God." Similarly, Genesis 18. 22 originally read, "So the men departed from there and went off to Sodom, while Yahweh remained standing before Abraham;" but this to the later Jews seemed to border on sacrilege, so they arbitrarily interchanged "Yahweh" and "Abraham." To follow the Massoretic text in places like these is to perpetuate the prejudices of the Jews and is unfair to the original.

Occasionally the text is so corrupt that even the most ingenious of textual critics cannot restore it with confidence. Judges 5. 8*a* is a case in point. It is ordinarily translated, "They chose new gods; then was there war in the gates." Not only does this make no sense, but it is an impossible translation, nor is the different vocalization of the last two words by some of the Versions any better: "then was there barley bread." The only alternative left to the translator is a guess or a gap, and Burney's guess is probably the best that has been suggested: "Armorsmen had they none; armed men failed from the city."

Above have been indicated some of the several kinds of errors that the copyist made in transcribing the Hebrew text,¹² and for them the translator must ever be on the alert. In the great majority of cases, however, the text is perfectly sound, and yet our difficulties are not necessarily at an end. Often there is the difficulty of finding an equivalent for the Hebrew word. This is probably one of the greatest trials of the translator. Scores of Hebrew words have no exact equivalent in English; the nearest English word contains something less or something more than the Hebrew, and is at best only an approximation to the original. The word *tôb* in Genesis 1 is an illustration of this. The English word "good" is probably the best that we can use here, but it only faintly brings out the idea of the original. On the other hand, "good" fits almost exactly an altogether different word in Proverbs 31. 10: "Who can find a good wife?" The Hebrew language has some eight different words for "lion," and eleven for "darkness," five of which appear in a single sentence, Job 10. 21*f*. One can readily imagine the difficulty in reproducing these in English. In Hebrew, as in all lan-

¹² Most of them are the sort of mistake that a copyist in any language makes, as anyone who has done work of this kind knows only too well from experience. As an example, the writer once had a title transcribed "A History of Religious Bibliography for 1923," when it should have read "A History of Religions Bibliography for 1923"—a small mistake, but it turned sense into nonsense.

guages, the same word may have different meanings in different connections, and this has not always been recognized. The word "month" ought sometimes to be translated "new moon" (for example, Exodus 13. 4; 23. 15; Deuteronomy 16. 1). The word "holy" often means "taboo" (for example, Leviticus 27. 33; Deuteronomy 22. 9). The word usually translated "house" has a variety of meanings—"house, family, clan, nation, estate, state, condition." It all depends on the context which meaning fits best. The word *'ānāh* has a number of meanings, which have not always been clearly distinguished. The root meaning is "to answer," from which come the derived meanings, "to testify" and "to accuse." In Deuteronomy 19. 15 it is stated very explicitly that a single witness is never sufficient to convict a man (cf. Deuteronomy 17. 6). Hence *'ānāh* in the following verses (16-19) must signify "to accuse": "If a plaintiff with a grudge appears against a man to accuse him falsely, the two parties who have the dispute must appear before Yahweh, that is, before the priest and the judges that are in office at that time; the judges shall make a thorough investigation, and if it turns out that the plaintiff is false, having falsely accused his fellow, you must do to him as he meant to do to his fellow." In the light of this, Deuteronomy 5. 20 and its parallel, Exodus 20. 13, should probably be translated, "You must not bring a false charge against your fellow."

Another difficulty besetting the translator is the Hebrew psychology. The Hebrews had no knowledge of the brain or the nervous system. They connected all mental and emotional reactions with the larger organs of the abdominal cavity, the heart, the intestines, the liver, the kidneys, or the abdomen itself. They had no word for "brain," but used a word like "heart," and their "bones" constituted their sensory equipment. To give the Hebrew words their precise English equivalents does not make good reading: "My bowels are troubled, my liver is poured out upon the earth" (Lamentations 2. 11); "Our soul is bowed to the dust, our belly cleaves to the earth" (Psalms 44. 25); "I will bless Yahweh who has given me counsel; in the night also my kidneys instruct me" (Psalms 16. 7). To rewrite the Hebrew psychology is to create a false impression of the knowledge of the ancients, but it is probably the only way out of the difficulty.

In places the Old Testament is very frank in its statements on sexual matters; in other places it resorts to euphemisms, and it is not always possible to reproduce these in English. A literal translation is often quite

inadequate. It may give a totally false impression, like "the feet" in Isaiah 6. 2; 7. 20, and "spread your wing over your maid-servant" in Ruth 3. 9; or it may make no sense at all, like the expression, "uncover his father's skirt," in Deuteronomy 23. 1; 27. 20. One hardly knows what to do in such cases, but it is probably best to resort to a paraphrase. A translation ought to be as literal as possible, but a paraphrase is sometimes a truer rendering of the original than a literal translation. An expression like "long of breath" has to be paraphrased by "patient," and a sentence like "I find favor in your eyes, my lord" (Ruth 2. 13) really means "I thank you, sir," and ought to be so translated.

Rather often Hebrew, like most languages, resorts to ellipsis instead of writing the expression in full. Psalms 118. 7*b*, for example, is literally, "I shall look upon those who hate me," but this is an ellipsis for "I shall see my desire upon those who hate me," and should be so translated, or in better English, "I shall be avenged upon my enemies." Similarly, Deuteronomy 5. 11 = Exodus 20. 7 reads literally, "You must not lift up the name of Yahweh, your God, to evil intent," but "lift up" here is an ellipsis for "lift up on the lips." Hence the verse in question should be translated, "You must not invoke the name of Yahweh, your God, to evil intent." An ellipsis that has been generally misunderstood is that which appears in Numbers 14. 24; 32. 11*f*.; Deuteronomy 1. 36; Joshua 14. 8, 9, 14. It is literally "to fill after," but comparison with 1 Kings 1. 14 shows that the full form is "to confirm the words of," that is, "to corroborate." Caleb's virtue was not that he had "wholly followed Yahweh" (the usual translation), but that he had "corroborated Yahweh"; he had confirmed Yahweh's statement about the land of Canaan by his good report of it.

In Genesis 1. 4 appears the so-called *casus pendens* construction. Translated literally, the first clause reads, "God saw, as for the light, that it was good," which in idiomatic English must run, "God saw that the light was good." This construction is very common in all the Semitic languages, and is found much more frequently in the Old Testament than is generally recognized. For example, Deuteronomy 5. 12 is not, "Observe the sabbath day to keep it holy," but is literally, "Be careful, as for the sabbath day, to keep it holy," and so is to be translated, "Be careful to keep the sabbath day holy," and its variant in Exodus 20. 8 should be rendered, "Remember to keep the sabbath day holy." If any other proof of this

were necessary, it would be sufficient to compare two passages like Deuteronomy 8. 1, "All the charge, that I am enjoining on you to-day, you must be careful to observe," and Deuteronomy 7. 11, literally, "So you must be careful, as for the charge, the statutes and ordinances, that I am enjoining on you to-day, to observe them," or in better English, "So you must be careful to observe the charge, the statutes and ordinances, that I am enjoining on you to-day." Other examples of the construction are, "For I fear that he will come and slay me, as well as the mothers and children" (Genesis 32. 12*b*); "Be assured that your sin will find you out" (Numbers 32. 23*b*); "But you must remember that it is Yahweh, your God, who gives you power to gain wealth" (Deuteronomy 8. 18*a*); "That all the peoples of the earth might know that the hand of Yahweh is strong" (Joshua 4. 24*a*); "Do not notice that I am blackened" (Song 1. 6*a*).

The order of words and clauses in a Hebrew sentence is not always what it would be in English. All students of Hebrew know this, but they often fail to apply their knowledge, and an incorrect translation is the result. An illuminating example is Joshua 21. 43, where all translators have followed the Hebrew order of words to give the totally wrong rendering, "So Yahweh gave Israel all the land which he had sworn to give their fathers." What the Hebrew actually says is, "So Yahweh gave Israel all the land which he had sworn to their fathers to give them," that is, Israel. An example of a sentence in which the Hebrew order of clauses is not to be followed in the English translation is Deuteronomy 6. 14*f.*, which should be rendered, "You must not run after alien gods, any of the gods of the peoples that surround you, lest the anger of Yahweh, your God, blaze against you and he wipe you off the face of the earth; for Yahweh, your God, who is in your midst, is a jealous God." To keep the Hebrew order in such cases, as is universally done, is to make a very awkward English sentence that is not altogether intelligible.

A characteristic of the Hebrew language is paranomasia. At times it is comparatively easy to reproduce this fairly adequately in English, but more often the translator has to wrack his brains to get the proper expression, and must frequently give up in despair, particularly when he strikes a passage like Micah 1. 10-16, where we have one of the most remarkable series of plays upon words that was ever devised. A similar difficulty is the reproduction of the rhyme that is occasionally found in Hebrew. In Judges 14. 14 the translation, "Out of the eater came something to eat, and out of

the strong came something sweet," brings out very well the character of the original; but in other passages it is quite impossible to do so, as, for instance, in Genesis 4. 23, where each line in the Hebrew ends in $\dot{\text{z}}$. Even without the difficulty of rhyme it is not always easy to reproduce Hebrew poetry, and much of the beauty of the original is necessarily lost in the process. Neither is it always easy to determine what is poetry and what prose. The last few years, however, have tremendously advanced our knowledge of Hebrew poetry,¹³ so that much of the text that used to be regarded as prose is now recognized to be poetry, and it is the business of the translator to indicate this.

A translation is of necessity an interpretation, but at times it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to be certain of the interpretation. The text may be perfectly sound and the separate words well known, but the combination of words may be an enigma. In Genesis 5. 24 it is said that "Enoch walked with God," but exactly what does this mean? A variant of the expression is "to walk before God," but this helps little in the interpretation. It probably means "to pass one's life in favor with God," but no one can be absolutely certain of this. Exodus 20. 3 = Deuteronomy 5. 7, literally translated, runs, "There must not be to you other gods against my face," but exactly what does "against my face" mean? No one can say with certainty. It may mean "in preference to me," "alongside of me," "in addition to me," or more probably "during my lifetime," like the same phrase in Genesis 11. 28 and elsewhere. On the assumption that the last is correct, its exact translation into English seems quite impossible, and the best that one can do is probably to say "beside me." In Genesis 4. 7 the text would seem to be perfectly sound and every word is well known, and yet no one has been able as yet to offer a completely satisfactory translation. There is first of all an ellipsis, but with what word no one can say with certainty. So the first clause can be translated in a variety of ways: "If you have been doing right, should you not be happy?" or, "If you offer aright, will it not be well?" or, "If you bear this well, will it not be fine?"—three totally different renderings, and all possible, as well as others. Another difficulty lies in the Hebrew word for "sin," which is feminine, whereas what looks like a participle modifying it is masculine. Hence Ehrlich would make a different division of the letters and read,

¹³ See, for example, the writer's article, "The Structure of Hebrew Poetry," *Journal of Religion*, IX, 523-550.

"you will succumb to the first opportunity for sin." It is more likely, however, that the word *rōbēš* is not a participle at all, but a noun, identical with the Akkadian *rābišu*, "lurker," the name of an evil spirit. In that case the rendering would be, "sin will be a lurker at the door," or more freely, "sin will be lurking at the door." A third difficulty is in the last two clauses: what kind of clauses are they, and what is the antecedent of the suffix *ô*? It may be "Abel" or "lurker." It cannot be "sin," as is usually understood, because that is feminine. A possible translation of the whole verse is, "If you have been doing right, should you not be happy? But if you have not, sin will be lurking at the door. And yet he is devoted to you, while you rule over him." But this is only one of several alternatives, and, as in many other cases, no one can be absolutely certain of the meaning, and the translator is quite at a loss what to do.

One last difficulty may be noted, and a difficulty that continually faces the translator. The text may be sound, the words well known, and the meaning clear. The problem is to get a smooth rendering into English, that is at the same time accurate. Even a simple little sentence like Genesis 13. 12 is difficult to render into adequate English. It reads literally, "Abram settled in the land of Canaan, while Lot settled in the cities of the basin, and tented as far as Sodom." The picture is that of a nomadic migration in tents, but it is hard to express this in English. A more serious difficulty is found in Deuteronomy 17. 20a, where the reference is not to personal pride, as generally understood, but to superiority to the law. The king is to be as amenable to the law as his subjects, and is not to consider himself in this respect as more privileged than they, but it is difficult to bring this out in any English translation. A familiar phrase in the Old Testament is "to smite into the mouth of the sword." It is often translated "to smite with the edge of the sword," but this is grammatically impossible, and the better translation, "to put to the sword," fails to bring out the metaphor of the Hebrew, that of the devouring sword. When the expression, "into the mouth of the sword," appears with verbs like "to weaken" (Exodus 17. 13) and "to discomfit" (Judges 4. 15), its translation is still more difficult. In Isaiah 7. 25b appear two words that have no exact equivalents in English. Both have the preformative *mem*, indicating place. One is from the root "to send," and the other from the root "to trample." At best one can do nothing better than paraphrase the words, and then they are awkward: "It shall become a place where cattle are sent and a place

where sheep trample." The word "pasturage" is the nearest equivalent of both words in English, but this fails to bring out the content of thought in the original. Hebrew is very fond of using words to initiate action. Instead of saying "Go down," it is more likely to say "Rise and go down," where "rise" does not mean "get up," but is simply vocative. It is really impossible to express it in English. Its translation carries a wrong impression, and it is often better to omit it altogether and put an exclamation mark at the end of the sentence. A like difficulty attaches to the word "behold," and other Hebrew particles.

And so the list of difficulties might run interminably on. There is scarcely a verse in the whole of the Old Testament where the translator does not find himself in deep perplexity, but after all it is the problems that constitute the challenge to the work and that make the task of translation perennially necessary. No translation can be perfect, but each ought to be better than its predecessor, and because it is better, it ought to receive a more cordial reception than it usually does. Protestantism, for good or for ill, bases its religion on the Bible, and yet by a strange anomaly the vast majority of Protestants, both clergy and laity, persist in using a translation that is woefully antiquated and full of inaccuracies, some of them of serious import, as, for instance, the translation "virgin" for "young woman" in Isaiah 7. 14.¹⁴ Most people in their prejudice in favor of the old will have nothing to do with a new translation, and some even go so far as to accuse the translator of making a new Bible, little realizing in their ignorance and prejudice what the task of the translator really is.

¹⁴ Another good example of a wrong translation that is as old as the Septuagint and so got into the New Testament, Matt. 4. 4, is Deut. 8. 3, which, as Ehrlich has conclusively shown, must be translated, "So he brought affliction on you, and let you hunger, and then fed you with manna, with which you were not acquainted nor were your fathers, that he might make you understand that it is not on bread alone that man lives, but on everything produced by decree of Yahweh."

Shadow-Pictures from Japan

FRED D. GEALY

I

THEY that take the sword shall perish with the sword, I quietly read to my students. And as I read, my eyes see on the drill-ground just outside the school-room windows young men with guns in their hands rushing into formation at the raucous cries of their military drill-masters. They may be very young lads, for all students in Japan over thirteen years of age are required to take military training, the meaning of which, we understand, is "spiritual."¹ That is to say, it is not the hope that well-practiced soldiers shall be immediately developed from these lads but that they shall be taught the "holy spirit of the Japanese army," as one student expressed it in a composition. Does the saying of Jesus, I ask myself, have any more meaning in a Christian school than it does elsewhere? Or have we made so complete an adjustment to our environment that our temperatures don't even rise when we come into contact with such a really fearful prophecy? If we only knew the things which belong unto peace, we might well shake with strong crying and tears lest this foreboding word of Jesus should again prove true!

Yet our Christian institutions are helping to perpetuate a psychology and a social order which are exactly antithetical to the purpose for which they exist. It is not that we merely tolerate the continuation of such a psychology and such a social order, but that we help their continuance. Nor is it that we are blind. We are only partly deceived, and a part of that part is only self-deception. We have more insight than we make use of. The truth is that we are held in the grip of a power that is absolute and relentless—the power of the modern nation-state. It is not quite true to say that modern states have been characterized by the morals of brigands, but like brigands, their power is the power of the sword. Hence when governments play the fiddle, all but the lame and the halt and the blind dance. And that there is military training in all the Christian boys' schools in Japan does not, I think, represent the spirit or will of many Japanese Christian educators. The militarization of the youth is not a system that was initiated

¹ Only from the third year of middle school do students handle guns.

by our administrators themselves. It has been put upon us by the army in conjunction with the National Board of Education. And we have not resisted.

Not, I may say, that there is much evidence of a desire to resist. I have often heard the gentlest of administrators solemnly state at trustees' meetings that the result of the military training has been good. And the impression is inescapable that there is yet lacking in Japan any widespread sense of war as a crime against civilization and as perhaps destined to bring the modern world tottering to its ruin. It is perhaps too much to expect that any people whose wars have always been glamorously and spectacularly successful could realize that it is not ignorance, poverty, or disease which threatens the destruction of the modern world, but war. There is no mighty movement in Japan against war. There are some brave, strong voices which make themselves heard for peace. There are doubtless many men of position who in a quiet way are exercising a powerful influence in the direction of peace. And there are many well-wishers of peace. But the masses of people are not awake to the futility of war as a means of solving the economic and national problems of the modern world. Are the people of any country awake to it? Or have we all settled back to the lethargic position that we do not live in Utopia, that wars are undesirable but inevitable, and that our only course is to get ready for them? This is the only point of view which could permit Christian people to witness the militarization of their youth—if it can be done by military training, and such training is always partially successful. The militarization of modern peoples is not based upon the belief that war is desirable, or right, or even practicable, but upon the belief that it is inevitable. Some thoughtful Christians did not try to defend Japan's part in the Manchurian affair on the ground that it was desirable, or right, or even likely to be economically profitable; they defended it on the ground that it was inevitable. What else could we do? they asked. The logic here is not that might makes right; it is that inevitability makes right. What must be, lies beyond the control of the moral will; hence it has as little to do with morals as does the splitting of a rock by the penetration of the root of a tree. Again, there is the deep-seated conviction that self-preservation is the first law of life, and that national self-preservation is impossible apart from a formidable army and navy, and is most likely not to be preserved without war. In a bandit-ridden world, one must carry guns and know how to use them. Let it be clear that until

Japan is convinced that war is not inevitable in the modern world, and that modern wars do not preserve but destroy nations, the peace movement here will remain anæmic. And how is Japan to learn these lessons? Is it too much to say that as the West has taught Japan the arts of modern warfare, so too there rests with the West the responsibility of teaching her the arts of peace? And how difficult these are to teach! We must learn them first before we can teach them. Have we the patience and the will? Is it too late?

II

Last week a strange invitation came to us. A young man who some years ago had attended a Sunday morning English Bible class, and who in the meantime had been for a number of years about the world, came to call. A friend and former teacher of his, he said, a certain retired infantry colonel, wished to entertain Mrs. Gealy and me for dinner. It was an unusual pleasure for us to accept. In the first place, the gentleman was quite a stranger to us. And it seemed very gracious for an unknown person to extend us this honor. In the second place, it is rather unusual for us to be entertained in Japanese homes. Only rarely do our friends open their homes to us. And as we are fascinated by the quiet beauty and restful simplicity of the Japanese interior, and charmed by its modesty and sincerity, the experience is always one that is anticipated with delight. Then, too, we have become very fond of Japanese food. Its flavors are inimitable. The rarities of sea and mountain are sought out for its ingredients. It is served with an art that only Japanese have the patience to create. The low lacquer tray-table before each guest laden with delicacies in covered lacquer bowls or in little china dishes transports one to the land of pure delight. Who would not covet this experience?

We leave our shoes on the stone step in the entrance. Stepping up into the house, we walk along the polished floor of the long hallway, which is along the outer wall (if it can be called a wall, since it is composed of sliding doors which are neither doors nor windows since they are both) of the house, until we come to the parlor. We meet our host for the first time. He is sitting on the *tatami*² in Japanese clothes. We too drop to the floor on our knees, and bowing low, amid a profusion of polite phrases, we tell each other that this is the first time we have met, each one announcing his

²The straw or reed mats, two inches thick, three by six feet in size, which compose the floor of a Japanese room.

own name, and he welcoming us and we thanking him for his honorable invitation. Then his wife, and their sons and their sons' wives, and their daughters and their daughters' husbands, and their grandchildren appear in quiet procession to greet the first foreigners that have ever entered their home. And so we pass the evening together in pleasant conversation. And though we are strange and mysterious to each other, yet we are bound together by that deeper humanity out of which both our cultures have grown, and we feel akin.

The colonel is a quiet, gentle man. And this seems strange. He has devoted his life to the training of soldiers; I have aspired to be a good shepherd; yet I am not more gentle than he. Doubtless the training-grounds have often shuddered at the hoarse-throated cries with which he has commanded his men; I strive not to lift up my voice nor cry in the streets; and yet I am not more self-restrained than he. And this is the mystery of Japan. It seems so inconsistent with the real genius of the people that there should be all this feverish concern with armies and navies. There is here a native refinement, a quiet self-control, which has rarely been equalled and never surpassed. All the savage barbarity of war one would suppose to be utterly foreign to the Japanese spirit. How can a people who love to sit quietly on a summer evening and through the pine trees watch the moon weave its way up into the sky, or who gather fireflies in cages to muse upon their opalescent lights, and in whose ears the hum of the meanest insect strikes chords that awaken echoes of eternity—how can such a people be enamored with the power of the sword or with the thunder of guns? At the risk of being misunderstood, it must be said that there is something strikingly effeminate about the Japanese man. It is not merely that kimonos for men and women are cut from much the same patterns, or that many a college student has his hair curled regularly at the barber-shop (American men would do likewise if they had such obstinate hair!), or that a man may wear a fur around his neck if he chooses to do so; it is not merely shortness of stature, or slightness of figure, or the slender fingers and soft hands, which create this impression. It is rather that the soul of Japan has been permeated with an æstheticism which has refined and softened life, and has purged it of much that is crude and unlovely, and has removed it far away from savagery. And even in a land in which women have traditionally been regarded as inferiors and in which wives are still advised and expected to be in subjection to their husbands, men are not

ashamed to possess the gentler virtues commonly associated with women. How inconsistent, then, with all that characterizes the essential soul of Japan is everything connected with war. I cannot agree that *Bushido* is the soul of Japan. *Bushido* has been the soul of every country. It is the world's *samurai* that have bled it white. Of course, the Japanese can fight. Anybody can fight—except the Chinese, and we may teach them some day. But not anybody can produce the culture of Japan. The soul of Japan is its quiet confidence, its self-discipline, its capacity for loyalty, its patience, its love of beauty. It is in the arts of peace, not in the arts of war, that the mission of Japan to the world must be fulfilled. When in a middle school I hear the wild cry of a student or disciplinarian signaling the student body to rise *en masse* and bow at the opening or close of the worship service, it is not to me the authentic voice of Japan, it is a ghoulsh shriek from out the low-vaulted past haunting us with the remembrance of the barbarous ages through which we have passed and from which we do not quite know how to free ourselves.

III

A distinguished Buddhist scholar spoke to a group of us missionaries to-day. There are three types of Buddhism in Japan, he said. The first is concerned only with the after-world. Its devotees are content to take this life much as they find it, without expecting religion to have much influence on it. He gave as an example of this type of faith, the common double suicide of lovers, who hope to enjoy in the next world the life together which is denied them in this. The second type uses Buddha as a means of curing headaches or of obtaining various physical benefits. When the price of rice is too high the farmer prays that it shall be lowered; when it is too low he prays that it shall be raised. The third type is meditative; the worshiper seeks to quiet his heart amid the storms of life. Although the third is preferable to the other two, said the professor, none of the three reveal the true meaning of Buddhism. Hence he himself, though an earnest Buddhist, belongs to none of the existing sects, nor does he seek to establish a new one. He visits the temples perhaps once a year, but only in memory of his ancestors, and this he does not regard as a religious act. He rather regards himself as a follower of Buddha as the master's teaching is revealed in the sacred writings.

How he arrived at his Buddhist faith is a most interesting story. At

the time he was graduated from the Imperial University of Tokyo it was taken for granted that any student who believed in religion must have a bad head. And with full self-confidence, therefore, he set out to live the good life apart from any relation to any religion whatsoever. However, it was also a time when the young men of Japan were looking westward. The Western learning and the great men of the West had seemed to reduce to inconsequence Oriental history and culture. Our friend became engrossed in studying the lives of great men. He was especially impressed by the biographies of Cromwell and Bismarck. And what surprised him most was that although he had dismissed entirely from his mind any thoughts of religion, he found Cromwell and Bismarck continually expressing faith in God, and urging the importance of religion. Thus it was Cromwell and Bismarck who led our friend to reopen the question as to the validity of religious experience.

Then another strange thing happened. The young man came from a poor family which was not able to supply him with money for textbooks. So, in order to provide material for the study of German, he went to a book store and asked what the cheapest German book was. The reply was, "The Bible." In this way he bought the German Bible and began to read about Cromwell's and Bismarck's God for himself. And in reading the story of Jesus, when he came to the accounts of the last night of Jesus with his disciples, he cried, he said, though he did not know why. Afterward, he bought several Lives of Jesus, among them Renan's and Stalker's, read them, and then summoned a Christian minister, one of the most vigorous and independent ministers of modern Japan, but one of the type whose fetish was non-reliance on the West. "It is well," said the minister, "that you are studying the life of Jesus, but remember that Jesus was an Oriental and that you should not understand him merely through Western eyes; also there are other Oriental religious teachers of significance." The result was that our seeker turned to the study of Confucius and Buddha and ultimately became a Buddhist. "If," said the professor, "the minister had tried a little harder to make me a Christian, he might well have succeeded." In very truth it was Christianity which led him to Buddhism.

IV

The most sacred scriptures in Japan are the Imperial Rescripts. There are no Buddhist or Christian writings which are treated with like reverence.

And of these Rescripts the most important is the Emperor Meiji's Rescript on Education, which represents the foundation of all moral teaching throughout the Empire. In official translation, it reads:

Know ye, Our subjects:

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our education. Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers; furthermore, advance public good and promote common interests; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth. So shall ye not only be Our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers.

The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, Our subjects, that we may thus all attain to the same virtue.

The 30th day of the 10th month of the 23rd year of the Meiji.

Since 1890, the year of its promulgation, this impressive document is read on stated occasions before all student bodies in Japan. It is the most awe-inspiring event in the life of the school. While the student-body stands at attention the Rescript is formally presented, enclosed in a black lacquer box on a low tray-table. It is presented and received with quiet solemnity. And while the students stand with bowed heads, white-gloved hands open the box and remove the silk covering from the manuscript roll; and the Rescript is read as it is unrolled. When one sees a thousand high-school boys stand in utter silence during this simple but impressive ceremony, one senses indeed the presence of a *mysterium tremendum*. There is no religious service of which I am aware in Japan which is conducted with such solemnity and dignity or which conveys so convincingly the suggestion of the sacred.

V

One day I wrote on the blackboard of a college classroom these sentences of Professor Soares:

"Authority is a temporary educational expedient as obedience is an immature ethical attitude. They are together the lowest stratum of morality."³

The students were then asked to write extemporaneously an imaginary conversation between a military officer and a professor of pedagogy discussing the quotation. One student submitted the following interesting paper:

M. O. "There is no firm foundation in the life of young men nowadays. I believe that this is caused by denying 'Authority.' The most important thing in our life is to obey authority. If we deny it, we shall lose the foundation of life and come to ruin. I think authority is everything and obedience is everything in life."

P. P. "Yes, I must consent in part to your opinion. Authority is truly important and even obedience to authority is important. But there are two kinds of authorities: one is given by others, and the other comes from one's own heart; one is formal, the other spiritual. For instance, military authority is the former, and ethical authority is the latter. In primitive life, a kind of military authority is important, but it is not everything. Cultured men cannot be contented with formal life; they will surely search for spiritual life. They seek spiritual authority. And we must all seek for this and obey it. So really spiritual authority is everything."

M. O. "I cannot see what spiritual authority is."

P. P. "You said truly. One who does not seek for and love spiritual authority cannot see what it is. Only men of spirit can discern spiritual authority."

Another professor said, "The most important thing in pedagogy lies in the free development of the student, I think." "Yes, you may be right," replied the military officer, "but your idea could not be put into practice without destroying the unity of our people. If students are developed individually, their knowledge will lead them in different directions. And the result will be that if an occasion of need arises, some of the students will refuse to go to the front." "Then," said the teacher, "your purpose in education is only for killing men, without consideration of the morality of the case?" "No, sir," came the answer, "the declaration of war is always made by military authority, and when war is thus declared it is always morally right. Therefore it is always morally right to create unity of thought by suppression measures."

According to other students, some professors hold other points of view. "A nation without an Emperor is like a ship without a compass," said the officer. "Yes, that's true," responded the teacher, "Education is the mental exercise that teaches us that we should obey others." "If obedience and authority were thrown away from the laws of the army, the Japanese soldiers would be no other than those of China," said the officer. "And

³ *Religious Education*, p. 227.

if students were free from authority and obedience, there would be many miserable professors in the colleges of Japan," agreed the teacher.

VI

"Our harmonized Western music means simply so much noise to the average Japanese ear," wrote Lafcadio Hearn.⁴ Not even his clairvoyance could have envisaged the New Symphony Orchestra of Tokyo giving a highly creditable performance of the nine Beethoven symphonies in celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the master's death. No less revealing is the fact that since its publication on December 7, 1931, until May, 1934, 265,837 copies of the revised union hymnal have been sold. The magnitude of the sale figure itself suggests that there is something unique among hymnals about the Japanese hymnal. And this is true. In the first place, the hymnal is used by all the Protestant churches in Japan except the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal groups. But even this does not explain its wide circulation. For according to the latest statistics available (those for 1932, published in the *Japan Christian Year Book*, 1934) the number of Christians in Japan, excluding the Catholic and Anglican groups, is only 196,965. Thus the sale of hymnals has been over 68,000 in excess of the number of church members who might have been expected to buy them. The fact is that for many people the hymnal is the most available form of music. In Japan every Christian owns his own hymnal and carries it to church with his Bible. This means that the hymnal is not merely in the church; it is in the home too. And if one wants to learn to play the mouth-organ, the mandolin, the organ, or other musical instrument, the hymnal is present as a source-book for practice material. Doubtless one of the most striking characteristics of Japanese Christianity is its intelligent interest in church music.

The Japanese hymnal lays claim to being one of the most cosmopolitan of hymnals. Besides the hymns from English-speaking countries, it includes Chinese, Danish, French, German, Greek, Icelandic, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Russian, Swiss, Syrian and Welsh hymns. Sixty-two original Japanese hymns are to be found, some of which are of a very high order. Only twenty-six Japanese hymn tunes appear, and it must be admitted that not many of these possess a spontaneity and integrity of character which will entitle them to a position of permanent importance. Even when they have

⁴ *Gleanings in Buddha-Fields*, p. 57.

an Oriental flavor, its effect is often weakened by inadequate construction and harmonization. It would seem that the first Japanese hymn tune to be regarded as a permanent contribution to the hymns of the church universal has yet to be written.

The desire has often been expressed that older forms of Japanese music be adapted for use in the church, but this seems to be singularly difficult of accomplishment. Some interesting examples of the old court music have been set to sacred words, but the music itself is not at all suited to congregational singing. Many Japanese would say that the older forms of their music are not suitable to the expression of the Christian message. And it is safe to prophesy that in the future of church music in Japan, Christians will express themselves—but it will be themselves—in the musical forms which have evolved in the West.

VII

A window into the inner life of Japan is the following letter written by a college student last summer:

Dear Dr. Gealy:

How are you getting along? I am happy to state that I am very well. I am now temporarily living in a country temple of the Zen sect of Buddhism, fifteen miles distant from my home town. The neighborhood is quite free from all sorts of noises and it is very comfortable for me to live here.

I make it a rule to rise every morning when at 4:30 the monks begin to chant the sutras. The fascinating melody which comes droning through the dead silence of dawn is very strange, even mysterious. The sacred edifice is entirely surrounded with old cryptomerias thick of needles, the height and girth of which suggest a great age. From within the grove, down descends the sweet voices of birds and cicadas from dawn to dusk. It makes me feel, to live in this compound, as if I were in an unearthly land. But there is only one trouble I suffer from all day long—the bitter biting of “yabuka” or mosquitoes.

After the morning hours of study, in the afternoon I go down to the beach not far from here, with some young radicals. They are the only friends that I have here. The water is so transparent that the fishes can be clearly seen idling about.

My daily life is nothing but the repetition of the above-mentioned, and yet I am much satisfied with it.

Is not this Japan, and is not this life? The silence of dawn. The transparency of water. A forest primeval. Monks and radicals. Sutras and Karl Marx. An earthly paradise, but for “the bitter biting of mosquitoes.” And if there were not mosquitoes?

To-day's Challenge to the Christian Church

JOHN McDOWELL

NO one can travel across this country, as I had the privilege of doing last year to the extent of over 62,000 miles, and come in contact with all types of people and all phases of our American life, without being deeply impressed with certain challenging facts. Among these facts are the following:

1. That the present day in America is one of transition. Some say we are in the throes of a revolution; for others it is a day of fear and disaster. The prophets of evil croak out their dismal tale that civilization is played out, that Christianity is found out, that humanity is on the verge of universal bankruptcy; while a few prophets of good, trembling with new-born ecstasy, their eyes filled with visions of the coming day, bravely speak forth their message of hope.

2. There can be no doubt that to some this is also a day of expectancy. I met many people who seemed to be under the glamour of some great change impending. The spell of a new order held them undecided but expectant. They felt there was something in the air, and that something is a vague and indescribable sense that a new day is coming. This attitude of expectancy is not confined to any one class of people. It is found among the rich as well as the poor, the learned as well as the unlearned. It is a real factor in the psychology of the present tragic conditions. It reminds one of Paul's statement in Romans: "We live by hope." This is undoubtedly the condition of innumerable men and women in our land to-day. Personally, I have never seen the power of hope so manifest and so real as it exists in our land to-day.

3. Without question, this is one of the most critical days in the life of the American people. Much depends upon how we bear ourselves and what road we take to reach the goal of our desires. The next few years will be of supreme importance to the spiritual and social life of the American people. A wrong turn now may prove disastrous and irrevocable. The consciousness of this fact is beginning to dawn on both individuals and insti-

tutions and in many ways is the most hopeful sign in the present situation. We are passing out of the hysterical period, fortunately, and entering the historical and practical stage of the present collapse. What is needed at the present moment is thought, inquiry, the collecting of social data, earnest study of all social phenomena. We must realize as a people that our problems are half solved when they are understood, and therefore we must seek to understand them not only in terms of their effects but in terms of their elemental causes. This is no hour for superficial thinking or timid action on the part of either the church, the school or the government. Our people are ready to be led but they must be led by leaders who are qualified to lead and in whom they can have unfaltering confidence. Men, not mathematical formulæ, or political platforms, or expert operators, still determine the future of America. Spiritual leadership, therefore, rather than technique service, is the imperative need of this day. If the church has no live and bold thought on the dominant questions of modern life, its teaching authority on all other questions will dwindle and be discounted. When the world is in travail with a higher ideal of justice, the church dare not ignore it if it would retain moral leadership.

Doers we have in plenty, but where are our seers? Action is eager enough, but where is vision? Views there are in abundance, but where are the leaders who have a view of life—its motives, aims, its incidents and enterprises—seen from the height of scientific detachment and spiritual vision? One is convinced more and more as he comes in contact with the problems of this bewildering day that these problems cannot be fought through, or crowded through, or blundered through; they must be thought through, worked through, aye, prayed through, and for such an accomplishment not only sound economics but true religion is demanded, not only a scientific system but an adequate spirit, not only accurate information but dynamic inspiration. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the future of America depends primarily on its leadership.

There can be no doubt that the community is feeling after God in these days, and if the church does not lead, it will inevitably be ignored and abandoned. God is moving upon the world through many agencies, and the church that insists on ignoring or discounting the organized community life is surely striking itself off from God and the people. Present conditions in America make it clear that never was there such need of clear, clean thinking in the light of Christian truth as there is to-day, when anarchy is run-

ning wild and running red over much of the earth. It is now evident that our Christianity must pass from individual experience to social vision, social justice and social service, and be made real and effective in politics, industry, education, national and international life if we are to have a Christian nation and a Christian world. The church must lead the way in making trial of the spirit of Christ, not only in private life but also in the social order and world policies. It is becoming more and more clear every day that apart from Christ there is no hope at all that the dreams of a better social order will be realized. The thing most needed to-day in America is effective leadership in terms of the spirit, teachings and service of Jesus Christ, and for such a leadership the nation has a right to look to the Christian Church.

The progress of individual life and the complexity of society have brought the church face to face with the gravest matters which confront mankind. It is now obvious that the Christian Church must either advance into the glorious service and destiny which opens out to it to-day in the larger life of man, or recede to an insignificant position among the forces which govern the modern world. The church can never again go back to the simplicity of the first Christian centuries or to the small ideas of God's ordering of the world which used to pass for an adequate description of the functions of the church in society.

The question which arises at every turn to-day in our studies of actual life is: what shall be done to invest human activity with spiritual power and moral purpose? Men are asking to-day with greater earnestness than ever before, what part shall the Christian Church have in the creation and direction of our future civilization? This question cannot be ignored, and it must not be evaded; it must be faced fearlessly and answered frankly. It is evident that religion must take its primary share immediately in what is perhaps the largest spiritual and intellectual adaptation ever demanded of mankind. It is, indeed, imperative that the church should no longer evade the challenge of a world in which, with the capacity to overcome enslaving poverty and toil now actually at hand, the basic spiritual problems of life can emerge, not for a leisured few, but for the whole of every community in the world. If the church is to meet the challenge of our day, it must lead the rescue party upon every plane of human need. Nothing short of this will satisfy the challenge of this hour.

Life to-day is surrounded by conditions and forces which have sprung

up so swiftly as to take us unawares. The new outlook on the world and the universe given us by science has profoundly influenced the thinking of the few who direct and shape the thinking of the many. New means of communication have increased our knowledge of other races and have greatly complicated international intercourse, instead of simplifying and harmonizing such intercourse as many had anticipated. The replacement of human labor by machinery will soon revolutionize industry the world over. All these things lie within the Christian Church's concern. It has long ceased to be a question of whether the church has a right to any say in economic and social affairs. It is now rather a question of how human society can go forward at all without the illumination, the discrimination and the power of resistance to every kind of falsehood of theory and value which the church should be pre-eminently fitted to give. Nor is this a problem which will wait indefinitely for its solution. Industrial secularism has brought modern civilization very near to an abyss of material ruin and spiritual despair. It is only the prophetic leadership of a Christianity revitalized by the sense of its vast responsibility that can achieve the rescue of humanity by the redirection of its thought and life.

We cannot come in contact with the life of America to-day without realizing that if the Christian Church is to offer any leadership whatever in the moral and intellectual confusion of our time, its spokesmen must discipline themselves to think and speak in complete independence of hypothesis, the validity of which they have for too long been unwilling to test or examine with any seriousness. The church can never interpret its own truth in terms of the world's falsehoods. The message of the church, then, must be plainly disengaged from all fallacies and distortions, whether of consolation or prevarication, to which men resort in order to "by-pass" the need of facing the essential issues of the hour. The church must insist that Christianity as a social program stands or falls by its truth as a religion—a theory of the nature of God and of his relation to man and the universe. If at a time of demoralization, such as that in which we are now living, when everywhere standards are tumbling down and men are losing faith, hope and courage; if at such a time there are "seven thousand in Israel" who have not bowed to the false material values and whose hearts remain untouched by the corrosions of skepticism, selfishness and despair—that may not be a spectacular achievement but it shows that the Christian Church is still the salt, saving civilization from going bad. It is obvious that the

church is the field of struggle, but it is the one area of certain victory in these bewildering days.

The Christian Church must ever be in the thick of the fight for the kingdom of God, but she must function along the lines of her inherent nature and in accordance with her fundamental principles. This does not mean that her task will be a simple one, or that it will always be easy to determine in any particular difficulty what her duty is. The church never had greater problems to solve than those with which she is confronted to-day. Never was there a greater call for her clear spiritual insight, for wise statesmanship, for power to discern the true point of attack against the evils that are threatening the stability of our modern civilization, and never was the call for the service of the church more imperative. If the church to-day cannot reassert her old supremacy as a Christianizing agent, then the case against her will go by default and she must submit to a long period of impotence in human affairs.

There never was an hour when the nation needed the inspiration and guidance of a compelling religious faith more than in this hour, and for such a faith the nation has a right to look to the Christian Church. To her has been committed the duty of Christianizing the nation. This is the most vital and valuable work possible. It is deeper than politics, for it deals with the men who make and administer and obey the laws. It is more fundamental than economics, for it touches the sources and ends of wealth, the men who create and distribute and who accumulate and apply it. Never did larger responsibilities fall upon the church than to-day. She holds in her keeping the future of our country. If she is to be the moral guide the nation needs now, she must recognize that her strength lies neither in political policies, nor economic programs, nor ceremonial pomp, nor material resources, but in the truth she teaches, the life she communicates and the character she forms. The church has apprehended the will of God for the individual; wistfully the wise-hearted look to her now to apprehend and proclaim the will of God for the present political, social and economic life of the nation.

The Christian Church is living in a critical time and has before her a complex and difficult task. Will she recognize the day of her visitation, rise, as she has done before, in her God-given strength and prove her adequacy for the burden God has laid upon her? I believe she will, but to do so she must do the following things:

In the first place, the church must deepen in its members the reality of personal religion. Christianity in extending its organization has ceased to emphasize the necessity of personal religion, with the result that much of our modern Christianity seems to be stricken with unreality. The claim of Christ to absolute sovereignty over all life is not only discounted to-day but denied by even so-called Christians. We have come to see more clearly than ever that the only religion that can save us or the nation is a religion that makes personal character and shows itself in personal conduct. The primary reliance of Christianity is on the multiplication of men and women in whom the spirit and mind of Christ is a personal reality. Unless we can show that Christ has something to offer the world to-day to make it a fit place for men not merely to live in but in which to develop their whole personality and to get nearer to God, we cannot hope to win humanity to Christ. It is therefore one of the duties of the church to insist that in all Christians Christ shall be to them not only a fact in history, a truth in theology, an ideal in ethics, but a genuine personal experience which will issue in Christlikeness both in character and conduct. No thoughtful man will be satisfied with a merely external religion, for true religion claims the soul and in our best moments we realize that the Christian faith ought to be an inward and compelling force, dominating and unifying all our powers and making us active in every effort to make men like Christ, earth like heaven, and the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of Christ.

In the second place, the Christian Church must furnish men with a commanding conception of God. When the church speaks of God, it must mean a God other than an "identity wherein all differences vanish"—it must mean a God whom man can love, a God to whom man can pray, a God who takes sides, a God who has purposes and preferences, whose attributes, however conceived, leave unimpaired the possibility of a personal relationship between himself and those whom he has created. The tap-root of religion is the thought of God which it is the supreme function of the church to cultivate and exalt. To-day the supreme need, not only in religion but in education and politics, in commerce and in industry is the affirmation of an adequate thought of God commanding the reason, invigorating the will and stimulating the conscience, a doctrine which includes the spiritual meanings of all discoveries and embraces the yearnings of all hearts. It must be a conception of God that the scientist can take into the

laboratory and the student into the library without apology or defense; that the social worker will find helpful in his work among the lowly and needy, that will guide the statesman in his administration of national affairs; and that in its simplicity and sublimity will appeal with equal persuasiveness to the heart of the child and the mind of the philosopher. It must indoctrinate man with a thought of God which instead of offending shall embrace and embody the humanitarian impulse and the educational ideal. It must inspire in men and women a faith in a God who, whatever his other qualities, has the characteristics of "the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ."

In the third place, the Christian Church must insist on a more worthy realization and expression of the Christian ideal. It is now evident that the only form of Christianity worth having is "applied Christianity." A faith that does not bear fruit is dead. The Christian faith has nothing to fear except that men may be satisfied with defending the gospel instead of preaching and practicing it; that they shall argue for the supernatural instead of doing the supernatural; that they shall spend their time proving the immortality of the soul instead of living the immortal life, for, after all, the Christian faith rests finally not on an argument but on concrete experience. The church must insist that being converted means being brought into harmony with the mind of Christ—coming to share his values, his reverence for personality, his belief about the way to overcome evil, and his tenderness for all who are oppressed. Too often conversion has meant going through a process of personal readjustment which has left the men and women concerned still self-centered and still dominated in mind by the current ideas about money and war and the claims of the dispossessed. Many converted people seem to be chiefly concerned to meet with other converted people and discuss with them the inner movement of their soul, though the evils which Christ challenged go unrebuked at their doors. Hence, it is the primary duty of the church to inspire men and women to Christlike conduct in all personal, social and economic relationships. Without it the most perfect system of economic or political organization will fail. There must be a spiritual and moral preparation for a new social order. It is not the duty of the church to form economic programs or to manage practical politics, but it is the duty of the church to inspire honest and unselfish men to seek solutions of society's problems which will accord with the spirit and ideals of Christ. The Christian Church should insist

that intelligence and enthusiasm and not fanaticism shall guide the search for a better social order.

The most urgent task before the church to-day is to learn how to "practice what it preaches"—not only by training individuals in personal rectitude and integrity but by discovering in its own life and exhibiting in its corporate activities the vital patterns of a social order dominated by the spirit and teachings of Christ. A church that is true to the mind of Christ, outward-looking upon the world's need and its moral and spiritual mission to it, has before it a task and an opportunity such as has not been given it for centuries. Never before has the world been so willing to accept an authoritative moral leadership. Seldom before have average men and women, oppressed with a sense of futility and despair, of false values and ambiguous standards, been so disposed as they are to-day to receive convincing spiritual guidance. The Christian Church has everything before it in this crisis—a world to win and only its chains to lose. But it must be honestly willing to lose its chains. Never in the history of the world has there been such a sense of insecurity in the plans of men. Never has the church had such an opportunity to demonstrate that the gospel it proclaims is as wide as human life and as deep as human need, that a day of crisis to the Christian Church is a day of discovery of the infinite resources of God—resources which enable men to meet the present with courage and the unseen future with a cheer.

In the fourth place, the Christian Church must have a clear recognition of Christian unity, which will mean the federation and co-operation of all churches against the manifold evils of the world and for the upbuilding of the kingdom of God on earth. The gigantic iniquities of modern society are thoroughly organized and directed by able leaders. To accomplish its high purposes the church must excel all other organizations by the effectiveness of its methods and the wisdom and power of its representative leaders. The church must put an end to the waste of spiritual energy and consecrated money not only on mission fields but in all fields. We must have better churches, wiser leadership, nobler policies and closer co-operation before we can have a higher civilization. Fewer churches, working in harmony, will mean stronger churches. Stronger churches federated in every noble cause will mean abler ministers; superior young men will be attracted to the pulpit because it will seem more worthwhile to be there, when freedom shall be granted for prophecy and freedom also from financial stress. And

stronger men in the pulpit will mean more respect for religion in the community; more ethical authority operating among young people, more attention to the church among the men and women of the community.

Faced with a worldwide crisis of unparalleled magnitude, the church must have something commanding, something creative to say. The actual task of enlightenment, of transformation, of interpreting and practicing the Christian way in personal, industrial, political affairs must clearly be carried out in this place and that, in one country and another by Christian groups, Christian churches working with whatever wisdom and zeal may be theirs, but in every place and in every land these Christian forces with stupendous forces arrayed against them are greatly handicapped by one paralyzing disability—they are *divided*—and it is now becoming evident that these world forces are too strong for a divided church.

In this critical hour we need, first, unity within the Christian Church. A divided Christianity has no message for a divided world. At a time like this we must close up our ranks. We must agree to disagree on many things while holding to a common allegiance to Christ as the only divine Saviour and living Lord. If we have Jesus Christ as our Saviour and Lord, then no matter what the surface differences may be, we have a common life. If we are in Christ, we are one. We do not have to achieve unity, we have it.

In the fifth place, the Christian Church, whatever else it may be, must be the oracle and organ of the democratic spirit. While the church should not adopt any of the socialistic or communistic programs, it must be the exponent and representative of the social impulse for human betterment. This impulse is in some respects the most striking and vigorous religious sentiment at work in the modern world. No wonder that an urgent demand comes from the masses pleading for a reorganization of religion along more democratic lines. The Christian Church must give heed to this demand and that for two obvious reasons: the church needs the help of the democratic spirit in its own life, and democracy, itself, needs the baptism of the Spirit of Christ. The spirit of democracy does not demand that any denomination shall go out of existence, but it does command with a good deal of vehemence that the moral and spiritual waste incident to sectarian zeal shall cease. The church has no right to exist simply to perpetuate a ritualistic or theological oddity. The church must declare that to care more for a dogma about Christ than the cause of Christ is in reality disloyalty to

Christianity. If the church is to make the most of the present crisis of opportunity, it must, first, heal its divisions, combine its resources and unite its efforts in a deeper and larger spiritual ministry for the regeneration of the individual, the nation and the world; second, affirm that there is nothing wrong with the world which cannot be made right by the Spirit of Christ and the orderly processes of constitutional democracy.

In the sixth place, the Christian Church must furnish present-day evidence for present-day Christianity, and historical evidence for historical Christianity. Both are essential for a full-orbed New Testament Christianity, for each line of evidence supports a vital element in the gospel of Christ. It will always be, as it surely must be, of primary importance to the world to know that Jesus Christ lived and taught and worked and died and rose again from the dead. The historical truths of the gospel records will always be needed. If belief in the history of Jesus Christ should ever die out from the heart of the world, Christianity would soon lose its hold on mankind. We must hold to the historical Jesus if we are to keep our divine Christ.

But historical evidence is not all, nor is it enough. The Christian Church must go on to present-day evidence for present-day Christianity. In response to the disciples of John, who asked Jesus, "Art thou he that shall come, or look we for another?" Jesus bade them stay and see what he was doing and then report what they saw to John and let him decide for himself. (Luke 7. 19-23.) Now, as then, the convincing evidences of Christianity are the things we see and hear. They are the present-day evidence of Christianity for us. If Christ is a living Christ, we should see evidence of his life in what he is doing in and through and about us, his disciples. Christ said he came to preach glad tidings to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captive, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. (Luke 4. 18-19.) Is he doing this to-day? If he is, those who believe in him have no need to look for any other evidence to command their faith and message to others; if he is not, no other evidence will suffice.

The Christian Church will make a serious mistake if it assumes that the masses of the people are fairly familiar with Christian evidences. They are not. Those evidences need to be stated, illuminated, enforced and repeated all over the land by sermon, lecture, pamphlet and volume. It

is possible that this might prove to be the greatest service the church could render to the nation and the world to-day. There are valid credentials for the Christianity of to-day against which neither science, philosophy nor criticism can present counter arguments. The church has a wealth of offensive and defensive weapons in the results of present-day Christianity. The church must present a Christianity that does not need to ask to be taken on intellectual sufferance. There may be difficulties in the way of believing. It is well to remind men that there are greater difficulties in the way of not believing. It is now obvious that the challenge of the world to Christianity has never ceased, and never will. In every age Christians are required to commend their ideals, to defend their doctrines, to define their standards and to justify the way of life enjoined upon them. As in each generation they renew this task, they are called to take account of the new factors—intellectual and ethical, social and economic—which distinguish the situation from that which precedes it, but in the fulfillment of this task the church will find the present-day evidences without which its message will be discounted, often doubted, and frequently denied. There is to-day, no doubt, a growing indifference to the non-essentials in Christianity, but there is evidence that thoughtful men and women still care for the truth, for duty and for the spiritual interests of life with a deep concern. Even though some of the external forms of faith may be slipping away, the earnest-minded are clinging to the fundamental truths of Christianity, because they inspire faith, give moral courage and hold up worthy and satisfying ideals for noble life.

In the seventh place, the Christian Church must proclaim a transforming message. The first concern of the church at any time must be her message. Without it the church has no dynamic appeal. Present conditions prove that an informing message is not enough; a reforming message is not enough. Nothing short of a transforming message can satisfy the demands of New Testament Christianity or meet the needs of the modern world. History and experience demonstrate conclusively that the scientific mind, the philosophic mind, the social mind and the economic mind, without the glow of religious truth and power, cannot satisfy the soul of man or the needs of the nation. The gravest problem confronting both the church and the nation to-day is not economic bankruptcy, threatening as that is, but moral bankruptcy, which seems even more imminent. The necessity for a radical change of human nature amounting to a spiritual rebirth lies

at the root of the nation's problems and only a regenerating, transforming message can produce this needed change.

To meet the urgent demand of our day, the Christian Church must have a message that will create in men and women a passion for Christ's cause, and so a passion for all great causes. A heart made new in the love of Christ is the greatest preventive of crime and the chief assurance of adequate help wherever it may be needed. To improve the individual by the recreative operation of the grace of God in his heart is the special task and specific glory of the church. It is now evident that social salvation does not lie in the rearrangement of human particles but in the regeneration of human hearts, and for such a regeneration the church needs a regenerating message. The church must have a message to-day that will make the heart right and then righteousness will abound. "Cleanse, first, that which is within the cup." Put love in the breast and then it will shine in the eyes, speak from the lips and work through the hands. The feet will run on errands of mercy if the soul is merciful. Whatever else may be necessary, the supreme necessity in this tragic day is the increase of inner life through the feeding of the roots of life by a divine, spiritual, transforming message.

Never was there an age that asked more earnestly than our own that we Christians proclaim our message, or confess we have no message to proclaim. The men of our day want to hear the man who has a message and who is ready and willing to proclaim it fearlessly and honestly at all times and in all places. We make a mistake when we conclude that the people do not want a definite and positive Christian message. That is just what they do want and are willing to hear. The people are saying to their spiritual leaders and teachers to-day just what they said to Moses: "Go thou and hear all the Lord, our God, shall speak unto thee, and we will hear it and do it."

What men want now is the essential message of Christianity translated into the thought forms of present-day life. They want this message delivered with moral and spiritual authority so that it will grip and command the mind, the conscience, the will, and the heart. The people are hungry for the great spiritual verities of Christianity. They are tired of doubt, and speculation, and abstract theories. What they are asking for to-day is not more sermons, but more soul messages; not more services, but more spiritual life; not more ceremonies, but more Christlikeness of character. Men want a message to-day that will catch the ear and change the heart

of the sinner, win the mind of the scholar and satisfy the soul of the saint. There is only one message which will do that—the Gospel of Christ. Present conditions make it clear that the Christian Church must return to the original Christian message as found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments if it would transform the world, or even help it.

Let me insist again that the first concern of the Christian Church at any time and every time must be her message. To insist upon this is not to take an intellectualistic view of the church's function; it is rather to demand that her faith should be "full of eyes," her love radiant with intelligence, her will backed by insight, her aspirations informed by a positive content in her eternal message. The church's message to-day must embody a truth which demands the most perfect concurrence of the intellect, the emotions and the will for its apprehension. To know that message is to have eternal life; to be faithful to it is to have life abundant.

It is a noble and arduous adventure to which the Christian Church must summon the world, an adventure which demands the keenest and most constructive intellects that modern society can produce, that demands the most indomitable perseverance and unflinching courage. It is now evident that the church must either condemn the world and seek to change it, or tolerate the world and conform to it. In the latter case it surrenders its message and its mission. The other possibility has never yet been tried with full faith on a large scale. All the leadings of God in contemporary history and all the promptings of Christ's spirit in our heart urge us to-day to make the trial. On this choice is staked the future of the Christian Church.

Religion, Democracy and the Changing Social Order

FRANK A. HORNE

THE seeming verities and foundations of the former days are under tests and strains hitherto unknown. What will be the function of religion in the inevitable social and economic changes just ahead? Can democracy survive the crisis and can the transition be accomplished within its framework? Both religion and democracy are priceless heritages of humanity; the one, an age-long and universal experience and possession of mankind, the other the triumph of popular government in more recent history.

Obviously this discussion deals only with certain related phases of the wide scope of the title. It is now generally accepted by authoritative economists that the economic depression is not another business cycle but the symptom of a major movement toward a new social epoch of history. We may not disregard the evidences that economic forces and technological developments are compelling a reconstructed system. Happily these tendencies are in accord with democratic principles of the primacy of human rights, and the religious concept of brotherhood and co-operation. The present calamity may therefore be regarded as the evidence of a world disorder and a solemn warning leading to social repentance and regeneration, and signaling a great opportunity of advance.

A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

Historical perspective is needed just now in recognition of the great political and social epochs in the life of mankind, clearly marked by certain characteristics and determinative forces. Feudalism came and went, and now individualistic industrialism is passing to some form of co-operativism. These eras of course overlapped and the transitional periods indicate that evolution and orderly development is the historic process.

The old haphazard *laissez-faire* system is on the wane and a new socialized and planned economy is on the way. The old order was serviceable in the period of expansion, exploration and conquest of nature, when

society was always confronted with the problem of scarcity and the work of the world was performed largely by manpower and work animals. Now man remains the consumptive unit, but the machines and abundant energy that drives them constitute the productive agency. Harper Leech, in his booklet, *Plenty—Can Man Have It Without Sharing It?* tells us that the working power of ancient Egypt, or of the United States under Jefferson, was less than the power generated on the aircraft-carrier Lexington in our Navy to-day. He further illustrates the change by affirming that the human engine is about equal in power to the motor operating an average household electrical refrigerator. In a little over the first quarter of the present century, that is, from 1900 to 1928, animal power decreased by eight per cent but mechanical power increased over twenty times. Stuart Chase estimates that there has been a fortyfold increase in physical and mechanical energy available in the United States from 1830 to the present time, and yet he says the average standard of living is still below the margin of health and decency. He is talking of power and not of machines. It is undeniable that both efficient and economical machinery and available power to operate the same will increase as time goes on and therefore the problem is one of adjustment to human relationships. The total machine power in our country is equal to about one hundred slaves per person. The question is, will machines continue to be the servants of men or become the masters? Economics and ethics demand that mankind assume and maintain mastery of these modern forces. It is true that inventions and new machines create new jobs as well as take work away, but the balance is on the side of human release from burden bearing and a great increase of leisure from manual endeavor. Tugwell rightly predicts that more and more mechanical power and machines will replace the repetitive and monotonous tasks of mankind, releasing the race to higher forms of activity and constructive work.

The anomaly of great abundance, large surplusses of goods, unused productive capacity, co-existing with tragic human need, unemployment, destitution and all the consequences thereof, thrusts the problem from economics to sociology, ethics and religion. The present system is condemned by the utter failure of society to balance production and consumption in any proper distribution to the human family. The old law of supply and demand no longer functions and technological over-production continues the out-of-balance economy. We are still in a vicious circle from which

there seems to be no escape but the long swing to a new economy. Starting with the crash of 1929 we had deflation of values, bad business, reduced payrolls, unemployment, reduced buying power resulting again in further bad business and so on ad infinitum. The collapse of the present system is shown by the tremendous decline in earnings and the impairment of reserves due to heavy losses. The tragedy therefore affects all classes but the burden falls heaviest upon the wage earner. Fair compensation is impossible under such conditions. Remedial action is forced upon society to save the majority who have no sufficient surplus. This class constitutes the consumer's market of the world.

Long before the collapse of 1929 and in fact during the height of the post-war boom, the maladjustments of the present order and its anti-Christian aspects were apparent. In 1927, Dr. W. I. King tells us, the average income of factory workers in the United States was \$23.38 per week. As a result of the depression this had decreased in 1931 to \$20.31 a week. This covers the average wages of workers and takes no account of unemployment, and since workers known as labor aristocrats in highly skilled lines of course received much more than the average wage, it is clear that many thousands, in distressed agriculture, among female workers and in the unskilled labor classes, were compelled to live in poverty with no security for the future. The Chicago standard budget of 1925 provided for an annual expenditure of \$1,548.84 over and above rent as a minimum for a family of five. In 1926 the minimum budget of the National Industrial Conference Board for New York was \$1,907 per annum for a family of five. In 1918 a survey of 12,000 families showed an average income of \$1,513 for families averaging 4.9 per cent. While there was an increase of wages during the years of prosperity to 1929, there was little increase of real income because of the rising cost of living. Then came unemployment with drastic labor cuts and untold apprehension and distress. Common knowledge and observation supply the painful facts of actual suffering in body and mind. Reference to child labor cannot be overlooked in any diagnosis of the social ills of the present system. In 1930 the census reports 767,118 children between ten and fifteen years of age at work. The accomplishment of N. R. A. through the codes in prohibiting child labor is worthy of all praise.

Turning now to the inequitable distribution of income during one of our alleged prosperous years, 1926, Dr. W. I. King estimates that persons

having \$35,000 and over per year income secured over five per cent of the total income of the country, while the per capita income of ninety-nine per cent of income recipients was estimated at \$1,699 per annum by the National Bureau of Economic Research. This figure is comparable to the minimum living wage of \$1,907 above mentioned. The disparity of income distribution and the classification of persons affected is further shown by the following comparisons from the income tax reports for 1929:

<i>Net Income</i>	<i>No. of Individual Returns</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total Individual Returns</i>	<i>Per Cent of Total Net Income</i>
\$2,000 and under	1,029,254	25.45%	6.35%
50,000 and over	38,889	.965%	24.24%

Unemployment and drastic wage cuts since 1929 have necessarily cut the average wage below the minimum limits of decent subsistence. Conditions since the boom period ended in 1929 indicate a widening of the spread between the high and low brackets of income and disclose that, as usual, the wage earners have suffered most severely. The following figures show the percentage of income received during 1932 as classified, using 1929 as the 100 per cent base:

Salaries (selected industries)	59.3%
Wages (same industries)	39.8%
Dividends	43.4%
Interest	96.7%
Rents and Royalties	45.3%

These figures are taken from a publication of The National City Bank of New York and, therefore, come from a conservative source. These conditions, in view of the fact that sixty-seven per cent of the consumer expenditures comes from the class receiving \$2,000 and less, should lead industrial leaders to realize the real mutuality of labor and capital and the necessity of sharing more largely the product of industry and agriculture with their employees and workers. Yet on many fronts we see business, big and little, resisting the collective bargaining provisions of the Recovery Act and thus provoking strikes and disorders. How long will it take the business leaders to realize that the human family is and must be a co-operative commonwealth and not separate fighting units engaged in fratricidal warfare?

The consensus of opinion of experts and industrial engineers is strongly in favor of socially controlled planning to replace the old *laissez-faire*

system. Norman Angell in *From Chaos to Control*, Sir Arthur Salter in *The Framework of an Ordered Society*, Stuart Chase in his recent books, the Report of the Columbia University Commission on Economic Reconstruction, the "Conclusions and Recommendations" of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, and many other groups and individuals, unite in declaring that some form of economic planning must be provided. This is so clearly a definite trend that it may be asserted that unless such direction can be given under democratic governmental social auspices we may be driven willy-nilly to some form of fascism or radicalism.

The assumption of some of our senators in their investigation of Secretary Tugwell that all planning must involve something similar to the Russian five-year plan, is of course absurd. The War Industries Board and the Food Administration during the World War were social planning agencies in an emergency. We are now confronted with another great crisis demanding action. The present administration is giving us at this time a program of economy planning through the various departments under the authority of Congress, but we must go further in this respect and make permanent plans very soon for the plotting and direction of essential economic activity. Of course the cry of bureaucracy and regimentation will be raised and unconstitutionality asserted. We are getting, however, interpretations of the Supreme Court declaring that human rights are to be considered as well as property interests. Big business and corporate management are certainly examples of necessary bureaucracy and regimentation. We are very forgetful of and overlook the social control through government operation now exercised successfully in education, sanitation, fire protection, water supply, public highways and parks, postal service and the management of the Panama Canal. The abuses and scandals of the private management of public utilities are definitely leading to public operation as is the case in the State of New York under recent legislation.

Co-ordinator Eastman has recommended that the only solution of the railroad problem is government operation when the country can finance the transfer. It should be established as a principle that when the government in any form for public welfare must take over the administration of utilities such as the railroads or power companies, that legitimate investors shall be compensated by the exchange of federal, state or municipal bonds for the valid securities of the acquired properties.

Under the passing order the acquisitive instinct, private gain, and special privilege inevitably produced class strata in society and induced the rule of ruthless competition in which workers always suffered and the exploitation of the weak by the strong resulted. The old spirit of conquest and subjugation of nature and its resources has given place to the strife of the great industrial units for markets and profits. It has become a tremendous game for success and fortune. In this competitive order the human elements have become submerged and well-nigh forgotten. The old ideas of brotherhood and real fraternity have largely ceased to be considered.

A new challenge and motive must be found for the coming generation. There certainly will be opportunities for the creative minds and the administrators of the future. It lies in the call for communal service rather than in the incentive of profit and the acquisition of money. The tragic lack of the present system is its failure to provide security of employment and assurances of provision for the future for the worker and his family. The successful achieve this protection, but the hire and fire system and the uncertainties of employment, especially in times of depression, are veritable nightmares to the under-privileged which society should not impose. Therefore unemployment and old age insurance should be a charge against industry and thus afford that contentment and peace of mind essential to good work. The incentive of a public service career with security and insurance for the future should be offered and guaranteed by society in place of the present competitive scramble for financial accumulation. Lower prices and interest rates must come before large profits and excessive dividends.

The method of constructive co-operation should be substituted for the present rule of ruthless competition. Here is an ethical principle applicable to the whole range of human relationships. It is the difference between peace and war as is illustrated in international relations. It is the solution of most of our racial, industrial, religious and class troubles. It calls for unity, tolerance and combination for desirable ends. Competition is no longer the life of trade and the natural adjuster of prices, but the creator of monopoly and the cause for the exploitation of labor.

The issue is clear cut and inescapable. The present incentives of society are based upon the lower instincts of a primitive society in which too frequently grasping greed, sordid selfishness and money mania are the driving motives, while injustice, inequality and insecurity are meted to the unprotected masses.

The leaders of concentrated corporate power should themselves see the necessity for re-organization. The crisis has been general and the ravages of loss and deflation have touched every class and all business. Those of the property-owning class have been able to weather the storm and live on past surpluses or reduced income. The situation should shock them into a realization that drastic changes must be made for the general welfare. All groups in our country ultimately must sink or swim together. Leadership and co-operation of the intelligent and cultured classes are needed in a situation calling for action for the good of the total human family. The method of piling up industrial long-time bond indebtedness and the incentive of profit-making hitherto employed must give place to a system based on use and service under social control.

THE FRAMEWORK OF DEMOCRACY

The inestimable values of our American form of government should be preserved against any encroachments of fascist autocracy or class oligarchy. Since the establishment of our republic the rule of the people principle has been extended from the political democracy of the early fathers to racial democracy established by the Civil War. Now industrial democracy is the goal. This should mean a new declaration of the freedom of economic opportunity based upon human rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the privilege of the enjoyment of the abundant product of nature and civilization. This is the task set for the democracy of a new Christian order of society.

It is asserted that democracy cannot survive any major changes in the capitalistic system because they are both rooted in individualism. There is nothing in democracy, however, which cannot express itself in genuine co-operation. In fact, democracy must function by the collective action of the majority through representation and delegated authority.

The alternatives of autocracy and dictatorship, class or individual, are repugnant to the American spirit. Industrial democracy must be established in the further rise and development of the American commonwealth in response to public opinion and by orderly process.

In Russia, Italy and Germany they lacked our background of over a century and a half of history as a republic. In these countries the causes leading to the present regime were provocative of radicalism and complete reaction. We want neither sovietism or fascism in America. Class

conflict and revolutionary tactics for the establishment of the rule of the proletariat should be opposed as contrary to democracy, sound economics and religion. This destructive doctrine embraces no plan of reconstruction or assurance of competency and must be rejected as a descent to confusion and chaos.

Thus far our form of government has stood the tests imposed upon it, and its flexibility will permit adjustments such as are being made under the present administration in a time of crisis.

Some writers, like Berdyaev in his *The End of Our Time*, believe that democracy will not survive when capitalism is ended. He argues that both democracy and capitalism are strictly individualistic and must depart together. He sees it from the Russian standpoint, but we face the problem from the American point of view. There are some very striking analogies between the struggle against slavery of a century ago and the present agitation and demand for industrial freedom and equality of privilege. The old abolitionists such as William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips were the radicals of their day and performed a useful service in the controversies of those times. They were pioneers, and were among the first to arouse the conscience of the nation. It is interesting to note that Wendell Phillips took the position that when slavery was finally abolished the emancipation of the workingman was the next great cause to be pressed to a solution. He also stood for the equality of women which has now been accomplished by their enfranchisement. Every great movement needs prophets and agitators to awaken and focus attention. John Brown and his associates were typical of the group to-day who would use force to accomplish their desires. It, however, required an Abraham Lincoln with his constructive statesmanship and moral vision to lead to final victory. In our day therefore we should have tolerance and appreciation for the real prophets and sincere extremists, remembering that the radicals of to-day may be the conservatives of to-morrow.

Before the final way out is unmistakable we will doubtless need other great leaders to formulate and to some extent personify the new charter of industrial righteousness. There must be an advancing and an expanding conception of social values in our country, with such changes in the constitution as may be necessary to reflect the new public conscience. This has been our historic process and must continue as our democracy accommodates itself to an evolving socialization.

The accomplishments and policies of President Roosevelt in the interest of social justice illustrate what can be done under democracy and parliamentary government. The President's announced social program for next year ought to bring to his support the liberal public opinion of the country and the adherence of the progressive wings of both major parties. We are going through a process of trial and error, looking to real human betterment. Economic trends and necessities will probably force constructive action. Looking back we see evolutionary processes at work in our country. The great regulatory bodies like the Interstate Commerce Commission, The Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Reserve system are all social control factors in our business and banking activities. The various alphabetical agencies of the present government further indicate that necessary socializing agencies must arise in time of trouble. Progress may be slow but nevertheless sure and along widened fronts.

William Allen White in a recent radio address ably expounded the function of democracy in a changing order. The *New York Times* reports him thus:

"America's problem is to bring economic security to the common man and still cherish the weapon of democracy. The common man must always fight against the new tyrannies. . . . Reason is the classic weapon of democracy, force is always the tyrant's weapon. . . . Surely we can erect a distributive system as efficient as our system of production. Surely we can achieve economic justice without calling back the tyrants."

It would be futile to ignore the weakness of democracy and its failure to respond quickly to the needs of the people. The faults of the parliamentary system with the delays, compromises, and power of the minority must be recognized and faced. Recent history demonstrates, however, that these difficulties can be overcome under strong leadership and the spread of popular understanding by the use of the radio and the printed page.

In the long run the people will realize their interest and responsibility in the situation and act accordingly if properly educated and informed. Prophetic utterances and resolutions of liberal bodies are all very well and necessary, but we must get to the people and particularly to the rising generation with the truth so that conviction and political action will result.

In the field of social education special significance attaches to the recent

volume containing the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools sponsored by the American Historical Association and published by Scribners. The purpose and procedure of these studies are revealed by the following statements from the report:

"The social sciences, more than any other division of the school curriculum, are concerned immediately with the life, the institutions, the thought, the aspirations, and the far-reaching policies of the nation in its world setting. . . . The Commission was also driven to this broader conception of its task by the obvious fact that American civilization, in common with Western civilization, is passing through one of the great critical ages of history, is modifying its traditional faith in economic individualism, and is embarking upon vast experiments in social planning and control which call for large-scale co-operation on the part of the people. It is likewise obvious that in corresponding measure the responsibilities and opportunities of organized education, particularly in the social sciences, are being increased."

The conclusions and predictions of this Commission may be summarized in the following paragraphs from "The Frame of Reference,"—

"Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and *laissez-faire* in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging. As to the specific form which this 'collectivism,' this integration and interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence is by no means clear or unequivocal. It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property, or it may entail the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses. Most likely, it will issue from a process of experimentation and will represent a composite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear. Almost certainly it will involve a large measure of compulsory as well as voluntary co-operation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative. In any event the Commission is convinced by its interpretation of available empirical data that the actually integrating economy of the present day is the forerunner of a consciously integrated society in which individual economic actions and individual property rights will be altered and abridged."

The significance of this authoritative report is not only in the conclusions reached, but in the educational program recommended with respect to the social studies in our schools, which will be creative of conviction and action by the next generation.

We must recognize that no precise social remedy has yet been perfected suitable to the American problem. It will be evolved by processes of

development, composite of methods, and the discovery of a solution yet unknown. The solution of course will be augmented and supported when achieved by education.

RELIGION AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

A great spiritual awakening and a rekindling of religious conviction must be realized in a new way so that social salvation shall be an indispensable accompaniment of personal redemption in which special privilege and class enrichment shall be surrendered in a passionate devotion to the welfare of the common people. We must really love our neighbors as ourselves and not continue to deny in our civilization this Christian imperative. This will be vital and contagious religion.

Where corrupt and formal ecclesiasticism has stifled true religion we have social injustice and reaction, as in Russia before the revolution. Religion, because of this decadence, has been characterized as the "opiate of the people." Where religion is vital and spiritual, a passion for social justice has arisen and the teaching of brotherhood proclaimed.

The alleged conflict between the individual and the social gospel does not really exist. They are truly interdependent. The inspiration and incentive for compelling the reorganization of society along lines of cooperation and mutual sharing must come from the convictions of real religion. It must be a force more powerful and effective than the contrary motives of selfishness, covetousness and love of special privilege. On the other hand there can be no widespread and general religious awakening among all the people until social justice is provided, when "in those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge," but under the new covenant predicted by Jeremiah: "They shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying know Jehovah; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah."

The conservatism and illiteracy on social questions among churchmen and particularly among the laity is chargeable to acceptance of the status quo, but the present discipline of economic collapse, the breakdown of old fundamentals and financial losses has prepared the way for changes of attitude and method. Religion is playing its part in the growing antipathy to revolution and class warfare as means of achieving social reconstruction. Revolution is destructive and has no plan but confusion, chaos and disinte-

gration. It is repugnant to the religious spirit and spiritual ideals of peace, goodwill and constructive effort.

Gilbert Seldes in his pamphlet, *Against Revolution*,¹ says—

"The present examination of revolution as a method is based on the two propositions that revolution is not inevitable and at the present time not desirable. It assumes that one can be against revolution without defending the present order and even without belittling the objects of revolution. It is definitely against revolution as a method and against the revolutionary mind."

Religion cannot be two-faced in its stand against war, whether international or between classes in establishing social justice.

Berdyaev, a former socialist and follower of Karl Marx, in his book, *Christianity and Class War*,² rejects all forms of social change which espouse revolution or class warfare. He acknowledges all the evils of the present system, is a Christian Socialist at heart, but opposes all use of force as anti-spiritual and essentially wrong. He says, "The social problem cannot be solved apart from the spiritual problem." And again, "The quest of the kingdom of God alone can lead to victory. The ennobling of society, that is to say, its permeation by a spiritual aristocracy, ought to be at least on a level with its democratization." "Christianity alone can show the way out of difficulty, for it recognizes a spiritual nobility, the aristocracy of the sons of God, independent of men's social position."

Religious bodies must take cognizance of the leadership of the Congregational Council in setting up a new Board of Social Action and of readjusting its other Boards and missionary activities accordingly. Missions, education and philanthropy must now be considered in relation to a new and more Christian social order, and in the future such work must be correlated with the new foundations of society itself. Stewardship is to have a new meaning. It will be the devotion of talent, culture and qualities of leadership for the common good rather than for personal aggrandizement and the acquisition of wealth. Religion will be required to furnish the motive and inspiration to inaugurate the new movement and supply the type of character, rigid discipline and disinterested service which the co-operative commonwealth will demand. Herein lies the missing incentive and challenge which the coming generation needs. There must be a crusade for the re-creation of a new world of peace, brotherhood and justice.

¹The John Day Co., Inc., Publishers.

²Sheed and Ward, Inc., Publishers.

Thinking in a Shaking World

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

PROFESSOR George Santayana, in his volume, *Character and Opinion in the United States*, published in 1921, declared: "Never was the human mind master of so many facts and sure of so few principles." In the preface of the same volume he had observed: "Civilization is perhaps approaching one of those long winters that overtake it from time to time. A flood of barbarism from below may soon level all the fair works of our Christian ancestors, as another flood two thousand years ago leveled those of the ancients. Romantic Christendom—picturesque, passionate, unhappy episode—may be coming to an end." The years which have passed since these words were written have done nothing to discredit their insight. In fact the winter has come upon us and we have been looking about anxiously for materials we may use to build great fires so that we may fight the encroaching cold. The approach to all this was gradual. Mr. Walter Lippmann speaks of the period between Voltaire and Mencken as "an age of terrific indictments and of feeble solutions." (*A Preface to Morals*). Jacques Maritain speaks in one of his downright utterances of a type of thought "Which follows scientific fashions slavishly enough, as a rule after they have ceased to be fashionable." (*The Things That Are Not Cæsar's*.) Perhaps this is why the solutions are so often feeble. There are always belated liberals about who are bent on holding peace congresses in the name of positions which have lost all true claim to authenticity. Paul Valéry speaks of a Europe in which "The whole spectrum of intellectual light displayed its incompatible colors, casting a strange contradictory glow on the agony of the European soul." (*Variety*.) An up and coming university president of the Middle West writes rather wistfully: "As I read the literature of social analysis of the last dozen years, much of it darkly predictive of dire developments, I have an uneasy fear, that if this heralding of decline should prove true, my son, once he fully understands its implications, may damn me for having given him life so late that he will be obliged to enter what should be the morning glow of his career in the bleak twilight of 1950." (*Thunder and Dawn*, Glenn Frank.)

I

But already we see that there are gains even in living in a shaking world. Some of the things which have been shaken down have left a clear, wide view of almost forgotten skies. Already we are living in a more potential world because they have fallen. We are very much the better for being rid of the myth of a messianic education. And although it may be harder to realize the truth of the assertion we may add that we are very much the better for being rid of the myth of a social Utopia.

For a good many people the publication of Dr. Alfred North Whitehead's *Science and the Modern World*, the Lowell Lectures for 1925, marked the end of one epoch and the beginning of another. It was a veritable bomb which Professor Whitehead caused to explode: "The faith in the possibility of science, generated antecedently to the development of modern scientific theory, is an unconscious derivative from mediæval theology." In 1927 Dr. (now Sir) Arthur S. Eddington delivered the Gifford lectures, taking as his subject "The Nature of the Physical World." With devastating brilliancy and with caustic irony he described the breakdown of the old physics. The core of his position was expressed in a simple sentence whose quiet words expressed a revolutionary meaning: "I am convinced that a just appreciation of the physical world as it is understood to-day carries with it a feeling of open-mindedness toward a wider significance transcending scientific measurement." In *Science and the Unseen World* (1929) Sir Arthur put the defining matter with unhesitating directness: "In comparing the certainty of things spiritual and things temporal, let us not forget this—Mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience; all else is remote inference." The corollaries of such positions as these are far-reaching. Most of the pseudo-sciences exist because of a mistaken notion that measurement must be applied to aspects of experience which really transcend measurement. And even in New Testament criticism the implicit assumptions of the type of mind characteristic of the period before the arrival of the new physics often affect the balance and lead us astray. If the real world of knowable experience is a world of consciousness transcending mechanical interaction there is no discipline you touch from history through all the social sciences and including every sort of literary criticism which is not profoundly affected.

The myth of a messianic process of education has been suffering rude

shocks. The very significant volume, *The Educational Frontier*, published in 1933, is a symposium edited by Professor William K. Kilpatrick of Teachers College, Columbia University, and listing among its contributors Professor John Dewey. In this volume the admitted leaders of American education survey the present situation, a situation for which they must bear a large share of responsibility. In many respects the book reads like a Lenten confession. We are told that "our educational system has become needlessly cumbersome," and that "it has become involved in a sorry confusion of purposes or aims." Referring disrespectfully to a widely accepted technique, one of the authors states, "The accumulation of credits may qualify a student for graduation; it does not qualify him for intelligent living." Of the method of compartmentalizing it is said: "There is no more effective device known to man for keeping troublesome issues out of sight." It is admitted that "We have been so intent upon getting facts that we have failed to see that facts serve purposes." And it is even definitely stated that: "The real difficulty is the absence of an adequate tradition." There is an almost wistful desire for the time when educators "will all be in the business of building a vital common culture." Professor Norman Foerster, in a brilliant article in the *American Review*, has given a brief statement as to the idol-breaking work of this significant volume. Among the things condemned are: the bloated curriculum; departmental walls—that rendered the whole system chaotic and meaningless; the insensitiveness to contradictions in beliefs and practices produced by present methods; the obsession with science; the obsession with pedagogical method; the exaggerated utilitarianism; the illiberality and aimlessness of the college of liberal arts; the blindness of educationalists to the need of a social philosophy. (*American Review*, September, 1933.) So the admitted masters find that they must break the idols of their own craft. Dr. Abraham Flexner, in his volume, *Universities American, English, German*, says caustically, "America does not ignore all distinctions. It simply ignores the real distinctions." And later he observes: "Those responsible for the demoralization of the American college are not only lacking in intellectual rectitude, but—what is even more disastrous—they are utterly lacking in a sense of humor." Even those who refuse to follow with entire acceptance the sweeping statements of Doctor Flexner are forced to admit as they confront the array of facts he sets forth that the situation is one which may well arouse the gravest anxiety. Professor Bagley of Teachers College, in his trenchant little book, *Educa-*

tion, Crime and Social Progress, has criticized the type of education through whose process a premature freedom is all too apt to lead to anarchy, and has contended for an educational process where discipline shall prepare for freedom and shall eventuate in freedom. So we are beginning to think of educational activities soberly, in the terms of their genuine possibilities, and the myth of a messianic education is being dismissed from minds characterized by critical intelligence. It is hardly too much to say that the wilder educational mythos made it almost impossible to think with actual understanding of Jesus and of his relation to human life.

Perhaps the most curious memory of the romantic liberalism of the period just behind us will have to do with its messianic social Utopias. The liberals who belonged to this group were caustically realistic as long as they were dealing with Old and New Testament criticism, and when they were dealing with theological obscurantism. But the moment they turned to their social dreams they cast criticism to the winds. They never subjected their social expectations to the acid tests provided by the facts of life. They began by building castles in Spain, and there was always danger that when the inevitable hour of disillusionment came they would become bitterly misanthropic. There is no cynic so bitter as the soured idealist. In the brilliant phrase of Irving Babbitt there is always danger that he will go the full length of reaction and turn his castles into dungeons in Spain. So for the sake of maintaining any sort of permanent social idealism it was necessary that the myth of a messianic social liberalism should be dissipated. Many men have had to do with the process on the other side of the Atlantic. The bitter days through which we have been passing have had a corrosive effect upon American thought, and the stark facts of life have stood out in arresting fashion. The writer who has done the most to bring the reign of an uncritical social optimism to an end has been Professor Reinhold Niebuhr. Those who have followed his work have seen a natural advance in his thought. It was inevitable that so corrosively honest a mind as his would not be content to repent of the sins of obscurantists and intellectual reactionaries. And when once the instruments of his terribly incisive thinking were applied to romantic liberalism the result might easily have been foreseen. A sane and soundly buttressed social hope has become more possible just because Professor Niebuhr has done his brilliantly destructive work. Men like Visser t'Hooft have been saying that pseudo-liberalism can scarcely survive Professor Niebuhr's powerful attack. It will be good

for us all if this turns out to be true. However much we may dislike to admit it, one is only stating the truth if one says that a victim of the romantic dreams of uncritical liberalism became quite incapable of understanding the deeper meaning of the impact of Jesus upon the mind and conscience and heart of humanity.

Science, education and social passion have played and are to play great rôles in the life of man. And they are best able to do their legitimate work when we think of them with sharp and penetrating critical intelligence.

II

The sense of manifold and sharp tensions in human life is an element of the utmost importance in all contemporary appraisals. And the passionate desire to deal realistically and honestly with every ugly and brutal fact has become so intense as to be almost an obsession with many men of first class ability. All of this is tending to drive men to the fact back of the fact and the truth back of the truth. The question as to what meaning comes from eternity into time is becoming increasingly urgent. The new mood is bound to affect the attitude even of technical scholars toward no end of matters of criticism, and of theologians toward no end of matters of philosophical construction. For the spirit of an age invades the most sacrosanct places. A complacent and self-satisfied age produces a mood which subtly affects the instruments for troy weight which the meticulous scholar uses, and closes many doors to genuine theological insight. When we face the fact that only an age superbly alive in ethical and spiritual matters can be trusted to deal with a literature which comes out of such life and sanctions which have to do with its maintenance, we will be ready to make the most of the deeper attitudes which are emerging in our own disturbed world.

That over against ourselves there is an Other not asking our permission to exist, not to be changed by the fleeting play of our emotions as they pass, almost grimly solid in strength, the ultimate environmental fact with which we have to do, is the fundamental insight of religion. That from this Ultimately Real something enters what we have been pleased to call the evolutionary process and moves toward increasingly significant end is as much a matter of observation as of faith. Like all ultimate ideas this one is subject to almost infinite varieties of corruption. But there is a main stream in its movement through the life of man. And here we find intelligence and moral insight and spiritual fellowship taking more and more

authentic place in our thought of that great Other with whom we have the deepest and most significant commerce of life. The ethnic faiths have moments of flashing consciousness of these things. In the Hebrew prophets they become actually articulate. In Jesus they become capable of exercising supreme command over the mind and heart and conscience of mankind. But at this point the matter of critical importance is this: Whenever we think of Jesus as representing Time splendidly reaching toward eternity he begins to shrink, to lose potency and to become gradually a thin and an ineffective figure. Whenever we think of Jesus as Eternity entering time in all the potency of divine action he increasingly takes command of life and begins to reveal fairly bewildering power in respect of the deepest matters of individual and of social life. The disillusionment, the bitterness, the caustic honesty of our time have made more inevitable the questions: Does the great Other speak in the words of Jesus? Does the great Other live in the life of Jesus? Has the great Other become articulate in speech, potent in action and decisive in relation to the individual and society in Jesus? Ultimately New Testament criticism will have very little to say in connection with the answer to this question. If Jesus proves the key to the riddle of human life and the key to the riddle of the universe, these facts will throw more light upon criticism than criticism will ever throw upon them. In any period of limited human knowledge criticism may lack just the knowledge which would splendidly fit into the Christian view. We must always be almost mercilessly candid in pursuit of critical processes. At best New Testament criticism deals with vast areas of inscrutable darkness with occasional bits of light. The Christian Church in all its moments of living insight will insist upon holding a view of Jesus which answers to his mighty impact upon twenty centuries of the life of mankind. And it will never be seriously disturbed if so changing a process of study as criticism at any moment does not offer it particularly effective support. The Christian religion has access to sources of certainty which criticism cannot touch.

III

Just what has been going on in Christian thought during this period of upheaval? We will not attempt an exhaustive account but will content ourselves with referring to some movements which exhibit each in its own way the vitality of Christian thinking during this period.

On this side of the Atlantic the Liberal Evangelical movement in the

Church of England has received much less attention in public discussion than it has deserved. The two volumes *Liberal Evangelicalism* and *The Inner Life*, each a symposium, express the quality of a movement which impressed Dean Inge so deeply that he spoke of its possibilities in almost superlative terms. The divorce between piety and intelligence profoundly impressed the authors of these books. They attempted to combine the most fearless and critical candor with a welcome for all the richness and transforming power of a Christian experience such as had characterized the great days of the eighteenth century revival. The leaders of the movement did not lift up their voices nor cry aloud in the streets but their quiet potent influence has gone out all over the English-speaking world.

The Anglo-Catholic movement has characteristics which can never commend themselves to downright Protestants. But the new sense of the sacramental meaning of religion which it has brought all about the seven seas is a matter of the utmost significance. The perception that it is the very nature of the material to express the spiritual, that the material never comes to its full meaning until it wears the livery of the spiritual is one of the profoundest insights of which the human mind is capable.

The Neo-Thomist Movement under the leadership of men of consummately brilliant mind like M. Jacques Maritain has brought new intellectual vigor and moral and spiritual power to the Latin communion in many a land. The sense of the place of intellectual structure in religion must be restored if Christians are to maintain their self-respect. The thinking of Maritain has come like the summons of a trumpet to numbers of people, both Catholic and Protestant. And the new study of the *Summa* of Saint Thomas is enriching the mind of many a Protestant theologian.

The movement associated with the name of Karl Barth has quickened the intelligence and given new moral and spiritual power to some of the keenest intellects in Central Europe. Passing by many matters which inevitably become a subject of controversy it ought to be possible for us to agree that a good many people had gotten into a mood all too adequately satirized by the caustic bon mot: "An honest God is the noblest work of man." A period of bitter and corrosive honesty like our own was bound to drive men back upon the deeper sources of religion. And any movement which helps us to see that while one aspect of religion will always have to do with man's quest for God, religion can only live as God, in action for man, renders good service to all of us to whatever school we belong.

When we forget the truth which Francis Thompson expressed symbolically in the *Hound of Heaven*, many thoughtful people will feel that there does not remain much of ultimate importance to say about religion.

The thing which began to happen through Maurice and Kingsley in England and which first captured the attention of the American churches in the writings of Josiah Strong and Professor Rauschenbusch has become a force of very great potency in our own time. The social passion which glows with religious zeal may best be characterized as the action of Christianity rather than the Christianity which is in action. But the Christianity which fails to express itself in social forms has lost something of that authenticity without which religion becomes impotent at last. Even Christian thought must be tested by its power to make social action inevitable.

The passion for social action easily blurs our sense that all solutions are based at last upon individual decision. Utopian social enthusiasm which is unrelated to penetrating intelligence and soundness of character in the individual is foolish or tragic and sometimes both.

Sometimes a movement is very potent although it has never become an organized group in action and has not attained any sharp self-consciousness. Among the most able and vigorous of our younger theologians in the United States there is a very recognizable tendency to incorporate historic insights with eagerness and loyalty. The type of thought which results has been happily described by Professor Reinhold Niebuhr as Classic Christianity. But among the men inclined more or less to take this line there is also a very clear tendency to watch with eagle eye every significant aspect of contemporary thought and experience. And there is the greatest eagerness to make every true contemporary insight a part of the corpus of Christian teaching. It is not merely Classic Christianity, it is Neo-Classic Christianity in which these men believe. So that it is not too much to say that the Neo-Thomist Movement in the Latin Communion is being paralleled by a Neo-Classic Movement in the Protestant Communions.

When the movements of which we speak become more conscious of each other and begin to experience the process of cross-fertilization, we may expect a more commanding impact on the part of Christian thought upon the Mind of To-day. Indeed we may assert that the correlated insights of these seven movements represent a corpus of thought unsurpassed in contemporary discussion and unequalled in power to prepare us to face the curious and disturbing world in which we live.

The Dilemma in Modern Preaching

VERGILIUS FERM

MOST of us, of conservative theological heritage, will vividly recall the pounding of the ministerial fist upon the sacred pulpit. The preacher was cocksure of his message. Was he not a trained exegete of the word of God, one set apart by the laying on of hands, one who had a "call" to be an ambassador of revealed truth? There were outward marks to convey the impression of his authority: the pulpit was set high above the pews (even a stairway to help along), a massive gown which filled out nature's deficiencies, a bib-vest or a leaven to symbolize something or other, the reserved privilege to move within the area enclosed by an altar railing, the right to sing (though there was little or no gift in such art) and a certain immunity from otherwise legitimate criticisms. We were taught to understand that we had come to hear the word of God; what was proclaimed and enacted was not a subject for debate and was to be taken or left.

There was something restful and awe-inspiring about it all. It is still a refreshing experience to go into a church where the preacher reigns consciously supreme and hear the thundering note of finality of a "preacher voice"; there is a feeling of pathos when the deliberate attempt to re-live the old emotions is answered by a wicked smile that is forced upon one's lips. One could wish that one shared only for a little while the spirit of untroubled discipleship which others in the congregation apparently enjoy as they drink in what is said.

The scientific spirit which is held up as our worthiest work-a-day ideal prevents any such return of yesterday's emotions. It is the spirit of humble questing, searching, wondering; a spirit that looks upon beliefs as tentative, convictions always open to correction and revision, conscious that no fact is "proved" and that all facts are clothed in hypothetical contexts, with no induction as finally valid; in short, a spirit that recognizes to the fullest the limitations of the finite. It is the spirit that takes seriously the recognition that man's mind moves in the realm of probabilities; whatever he may say he says with tongue in his cheek. This becomes a mind-set and with it we step into a contemporary church.

We still hear the preacher praying to his God for the divine guidance to be led to the truth." His creed expects of him to believe that the third person in the Trinity has this as a function, to lead whomsoever wills to the truth. We hear that prayer and our scientific mind-set answers back: the only truth ever available for us is a relative truth, a truth only in relation to a present context, a temporary resting place amidst our turbulent questings but a place of respite which sometime may disappear when waves of new insight wash in. Is that the truth which we hear prayed for? If so, it is no different than the truth we have affirmed and seek; if not, is not the prayer quite impossible for one chained to a finite perspective?

The authoritarian preacher no longer grips us, save only as we can recall the older emotions. The modern preacher: what about him? If to him there is the consciousness of the debatable in what he says, how does he resort to effect conviction in the mind of his hearers? He has conjured up all sorts of tricks to make his sermon effective. He quotes Browning or Sir Walter Scott or Tennyson with an emotional appeal that varies directly as there is genuine literary *rapprochement* between pulpit and pew; and this is far from being a one-to-one correspondence as is seemingly taken for granted. He talks about that vague Schleiermacherean term "religious experience" and we are held convicted of being among the Gentiles if we wonder what, after all, is meant. He appeals to the dilemmas of the modern physical sciences as if those dilemmas were religion's great opportunity. Or, he may quote some distinguished name in the field of the natural sciences, distinguished in some particular context, as a prophet to lead religion back to respectability. Or, without the wince of an eye, he may ask us to become as little children, to cast off our sophisticated skepticisms, as though it were a matter of changing suits. He may seek to impress us with his liberality by speaking disparagingly of historic credal statements and the theologies of the fathers, and at the same time shock us by his acquiescence in some vague and indiscriminate creed and theology without form or content. He may entertain us with his diction, or his homiletical anecdotes, or he may play the actor and become dramatic; but though we are amused we are not moved. He may review for us some book which we have already seen in a more critical review. He may indulge in telling some mythical story, trusting that the point of it will somehow answer the needs of a sermon. He may preach the platitudinous "be good" sermon, and while we may yield our assent we neither have our minds fully clear

about that which is universally good nor our imagination sufficiently stimulated to turn toward a new horizon. Or, he may resort to the presumption that if the economists and the sociologists have not succeeded in diagnosing the social evils, he, in the name of religion, has something to say upon a pending bill before the legislature, a proposal before the League of Nations, upon crime—questions which, for many of us who sit in the pew, are a thousand times more complicated than the pronouncement seems to suggest.

There is, I take it, something incompatible about preaching and the scientific spirit. In vital preaching there is (or ought to be) a burning conviction, something that corresponds to a "thus saith the Lord." In Bruce Barton terminology there is (or ought to be) the passion of a salesman who believes sincerely and utterly in the merits of his wares, for without such a belief the prospective buyer is given a tremendous psychological advantage in self-defense. What is vital preaching without an apologetic? It may be, to say the least, a humble testimony, but it is surely thin and vapid without the fire of self-defense and without something of the spirit of the polemical, if there is a doubter in the crowd. But all this is not the scientific spirit.

The dilemma might be stated thus: either some form of highly dubitable though powerful authoritarianism (implicit in a vigorous sermon) or the more intellectually promising though unmoving platform, the spirit of cautious inquiry (which all but dissipates that power). The dubitable of the first becomes indubitable only to the dogmatist or to one who can find some experiential *rapprochement* with the claims of the speaker; the more promising of the second becomes less so only to him who would surrender the best approach, known to man, to find the truth. The authoritarianism of the powerful kind of preaching does not fit the mind given to the scientific spirit; whatever authoritarianism the latter will admit is always qualified by the consciousness of the possibility of error or partial insight. The preaching of him who is given to the scientific spirit suffers the lack of appeal to those of the old school and is quite without the power characteristic of good preaching to those of the new. We have here a dilemma which is becoming increasingly real and perplexing to those who still have enough of the old emotional ties to want to keep attached to some pulpit either as a hearer or as an occupant but do not know what is to be done about it. In pointing out a dilemma one need not be charged with disrespect toward

those preachers who are making heroic efforts to win favor and power or with any taint of cynicism; one is merely pointing to a condition which is engulfing the modern preacher and making his task amazingly difficult.

.

If Cousin's ghost should tap one on the shoulder we might surmise that voice whispering the word of alleged counsel: the solution of the dilemma is eclecticism; the way open is not the one horn or the other but the one *and* the other. But, we frankly ask, how can there be a marriage between a powerful authoritarian preaching and an unpowerful scientifically-minded preaching? To court both is to have the awkward contradiction of the loud voice and the pounding fist together with the tongue in the cheek and the raised eyebrow. The one outstanding weakness of modern liberal preaching is this business of trying to ride two horses galloping in opposite directions; or, to change the figure: the one hand is giving what the other hand seems slyly to take away.

If Hegel's ghost should do the tapping we might hear the words: Thou fool, find the synthesis; it is not the union of two opposites but the result of their clash which issues in a new species. If that is so, what then is the new species? Is it to mean that there is to be no more of that kind of preaching? Some to-day would seem to be saying just this; the solution of the dilemma is to be had in a more intricately worked-out ritual, more glamour for the eye and the musical ear, or, more mystic silence. Good old-fashioned Quakerism or high-church Catholicism (Roman or Anglican) may unwittingly be furnishing the united chorus offering the solution. Protestantism may all along have been heading in the wrong direction in this regard. The *emphasis* upon preaching is of Protestant origin and may be a kind of Protestant bugaboo. We have not noticed the mistake until our present dilemma has forced it out in the open and upon us; the time was when appeal could be made to an unquestioned authority and it made for powerful preaching, the center of the Protestant service. Now that the modern temper of mind is in clash with authority the solution appears to be in a reconsideration of what were once (allegedly) fundamental premises; perhaps we need to admit the necessity of some quite different species of appeal. Perhaps powerful preaching can no longer come by way of conceptual formulations, not by way of homiletic art, not by the wedding of one brand of thought with another ("science" and "religion," for example); it is to come by way of some form of unspoken art or not at

all. This, so we seem to behold, is the newer note in a contemporary synthesis. But, we deliberately ask, is this preaching? Surely not.

If the ghost of Kant should come upon us we might hear him chuckle and say: O man, do not think more highly of your so-called scientific temper than you ought; at most it offers you appearances; there is not the slightest glimmer in it of what is truly real; only in the vague recesses of the "ought" will there be found a *rapport* with what is truly fundamental and significant. To which our reply comes: If this is so, the world of reality cannot be commented upon and there thus can be no point in preaching, surely no power because concepts cannot touch that which alone has the power to move us. And what is more, the scientific spirit may be taking us about in a world of shadows, but it is at least one where such shadows count mightily while they last. The very life-blood of powerful preaching would appear drained if the way to truth is only by means of unconceptual *rapport*, be it the moral consciousness or vague mystic experience. The Quakers and the rest, then, are courageously right in ceasing the attempt to straddle two horses.

.

Admittedly, we are in a quandary. Perhaps it is but the inevitable by-product of the fate of having been born in and continuing to live in two distinct eras. We would make music once more of the thud of the ministerial fist but there is no place for it on the score set by the scientific temper. The powerful in preaching is bound up with some form of authoritarianism; but whatever kind of authoritarianism is offered is robbed of its power by our present mind-set. To surrender the scientific temper is to surrender what has now become bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, and we can find no valid reason for giving up so vital and significant an approach to truth. The ghosts suggest their solutions; however our mind may nod its sympathetic understanding of what is proposed, our emotions continue to hold back our assent. We still like to hear preachers; though we go away disappointed we find ourselves returning, trusting that sometime, somewhere, somehow, some voice in the long procession will be heard that will move us out and above the grip of what seems to be an insuperable dilemma. The powerful sermon requires an exclamation point; the scientific spirit superimposes always its question mark. Will someone tell us unconventionally what is to be done with these incompatibles?

The Reply of the Preacher

JOSEPH FORT NEWTON

AS a description of the plight of the modern pulpit Dr. Ferm's article, upon which the editor has asked me to comment, is valuable after its kind, though it hardly touches the real situation. Clever of phrase, crisp in criticism, slightly salted with cynicism, it is too academic, too near the surface, as remote from the actualities of human need as it is from the hinterlands of our faith whence cometh our help. It does, however, depict the confusion and frustration, to the point of obfuscation, of the lazy, hazy, hateful popular mind which makes a muddle of everything, and of the preacher in so far as he is a victim of that puzzlement and not a victor over it. If this is the dilemma of the modern pulpit, then our preaching is not only foolishness, but a failure and a futility; and the description is richly deserved by those who deserve it.

The authoritarian dogmatist, dealing in threats and thunders, laying down the eternal law and the final truth in solemn tones behind the sacred security of the altar-rail, seeking to evoke and re-live the "old emotions," in face of a "wicked smile," born of mingled pity and contempt, is a picturesque irrelevance. Even more pathetic is the "modern preacher," whose rosy faith has faded into a forlorn wistfulness, or the garish cleverness called sophistication. In his bag of tricks, with which he tries to conjure interest, Browning and Tennyson appear as prophets, and Eddington and Jeans as apostles; now he is reviewing a book, now reading an editorial on the events of the day, or a literary essay stewed in cream; dipping into psychology to be "scientific," or denouncing the creeds to display his "liberality"; but, in spite of all, ineffective and unreal, having no medicine for the hurt of humanity.

Both authoritarian and libertarian are alike impotent, as men who beat the air, alike ponderous, platitudinous, or presumptuous, unable to deal with the problem of redemption in its tragic and gigantic modern setting, if indeed there be any redemption at all. What about the listener in the pew, if he is in the pew, whose point of view the essayist takes pains to give us? Alas, he is at the mercy of a "scientific mind-set" which makes preaching of any kind an impertinence and prayer an empty performance.

He lives in a spirit of questing, searching, wondering, in a world where all is uncertain and nothing ultimate, where all beliefs are tentative, all convictions always open to revision, where no fact is proved and no meaning finally valid. There are interesting probabilities about which he may speculate, but truth? What is truth? Who can say? Only the fanatical and ill-bred believe in truth, or make ado about it. A cultured man, if he be "scientific," is guided by relativity, and avoids illusion. Manifestly, in a world where nothing stands hitched long enough to be true, no preacher is needed and no preaching is valid, since there is really nothing to say.

One wonders why the essayist did not add the patter about religion being an escape-device, a defense-mechanism, or, better still, sublimated sex—which is thrilling. By this view religion is an outlet, a release—oh, the blessed word—for timid, emotional folk. It has no basis in reality; it cannot endure the criticism of intelligence. We cannot worship God in truth, when there is no such thing as truth. Worship is all very well as a kind of satisfaction of psychic needs which science seems unable to satisfy, but it has nothing to do with truth. Of course, to deny the existence of truth saves a lot of bother. Divested of dogma, life can be lived without disturbance, and not without joy—though, alas, it is without meaning.

Such is the "mind-set" which the essayist says inhibits not only preaching, but the response to preaching; and that is the direful dilemma of the pulpit—confirmed by the ghosts of three philosophers. One used to hear such talk among college students years ago, cocksure in their dogmatism and appalling in their finality. Why it should be called "scientific" is hard to say, since, if it be so, science is done for, along with religion. While this idea that physical science inhibits spiritual faith may cling to many minds, can it be rightly described as the chief dilemma of the pulpit? It is true that second-hand minds using second-hand facts have used it to belabor the church and befuddle the popular mind; but that vogue has well nigh passed, now that men of science are turning to spiritual vision to find some clew to the meaning of the stars and atoms they study.

No, while admitting a point of truth in the able and charming essay which it is my honor to discuss, some of us feel that the dilemma, as stated, is not the real difficulty before us. Far, very far from it. Indeed, for a preacher of vital mind and vivid faith—a preacher who has made "contact," so to put it—such a dilemma as the essayist describes does not exist. One can hardly imagine any great Christian preacher, from Saint Paul to Phillips

Brooks, being impaled on either horn of such a dilemma. The real dilemmas in our modern preaching—and there are more than one—are far deeper and more devastating than the essayist realizes. But that is another story, as Kipling would say, though one may be permitted to state the matter as one sees it, if only to provoke further discussion.

There is indeed a mind-set, materialistic and using the name and fame of science to "put itself over," which is deadly. It was set forth in a brilliant play, *A Sleeping Clergyman*, by James Bridie, which was so notable a success on the London stage recently. There was some discussion as to why the clergyman was put in the play. Once or twice he stirs in his sleep, but he never wakes up, never speaks a word. Some thought the dramatist meant that the church is asleep to what is going on in the world of thought, or perhaps that the clergyman was put in just to "annoy somebody," as Johnson said of a line by Pope. No, the reason is plain enough. For, if the thesis of the play is true—the fatalistic thesis that men do things because they must, moved by impulses and influences which they can neither resist nor control, as in the case of the hereditary life-set in the family in the play—the clergyman might just as well sleep on and take his rest. Such a doctrine erases all freewill and moral responsibility, and nothing the clergyman might do or say would matter the least bit.

Or again, it is my experience that for every one who has lost his faith, or failed to win it, because of any such mind-set as the essayist describes, a thousand have suffered shipwreck of faith and character through some devastating blow of ill fortune, some blinding bereavement, or the acid of some secret sin which dissolved the Pearl of Great Price in the soul. Those of us who are in the thick of things, on the firing-line, so to say it, know how remote the dilemma which the essayist emphasizes is from the lonely struggles of men and women with moral issues and human woes. Often enough, in fact, the very mind-set which the essay indicates is used by men as a smoke-screen, or a defense-mechanism, to protect themselves from the duties and demands of religion. They are happy to be able to kick up a lot of "scientific" difficulties to hide the fact that the first thing in religion is not right with them, and they do not want it put right—at least not yet. They await a more convenient season.

To go a step further. After a summer service recently in the City Temple in London, a lovely couple asked me to come and talk things over with them at tea. They were Christian young people, devoted if not

devout, but they were also Communists; and their dilemma was after this manner. They hold to faith in Jesus and his gospel, but they think such gentle and heavenly truth has no ghost of a chance in a world organized on a basis of greed, injustice, and social and economic "cannibalism," as they put it. The victory of Karl Marx must come first—society must be built upon a different basis, and we must be willing to fight for that end—and then the gospel of Jesus Christ will have some opportunity to grow. As they pointed out, just as the military genius of one Cæsar, and the statesmanship of another Cæsar, made a world in which early Christian messengers could go and preach the gospel; so, again in our day, social arrangements must be put right in order that religion may do its blessed work.

Still again, my late friend, Thomas Kettle, a golden hearted poet killed on the Western Front, wrote these words shortly before he died, in a letter: "If we admit war as a necessary part of civilization, we are atheists." The same is true of economic war, which may be no less desolating. It is the organized atheism of much—though not all—of our industrial and international life, which makes religion seem as unreal as a dream, its mysticism moonshine, its ritual a rigmarole. It is idle to expect men to develop the spiritual life when they have to fight like animals in the jungle for the sheer necessities, to say nothing of the decencies, of human life. Social workers tell of conditions in our cities which make even civilized life difficult, if not impossible. Such things cannot go on forever. If our religion is impotent to give us social salvation on earth, it will not be trusted to save us anywhere; and it will be given up.

If put alongside such issues, the dilemma in preaching, as pointed out by the essayist, looks like a dim battle in a doubtful land. Man is frustrated, confused, adrift, unhappy, acutely self-conscious, and appallingly alone. He has lost faith in himself and in life—dogged by a sense of futility and fatality. If life is worthless, so is immortality, and so why bother with it. "Where there is no God there is no man," as Berdyaev puts it. At any rate, man will not long remain man, erect, free and unafraid, if his vision of God grows dim. Nor will he live greatly for great things unless he believes that life itself is great and worth while; and that is a faith which the man of to-day finds it hard to have and to hold.

Religion versus Superstition

ALBERT E. AVEY

AMONG the many interesting books which come off the press in steady stream are treatises on the history of religion, religious psychology, and the social significance of religion—discussions of the part it has played and still is playing in various cultures.

But as one considers these treatises one often feels inclined to pause a moment and ask a fundamental question. Having read of the ceremonies of the Bushmen or of the natives of interior Africa, having followed the devices of the Taoists for appeasing malign spirits, and having observed even the elaborate ceremonials of ritualistic Christianity, the question sometimes comes with insistent force: Are these religion? If one has tried to use what intelligence nature has given him, and has made an honest effort to live on the highest level of civilization possible for his capacities, one wonders whether the admission of interest in religion inevitably puts one in the same social and anthropological group as the Australian and the Fiji? Are those "scientists" really correct who regard all religious minds as backward, if not utterly primitive? Are religious persons necessarily immature culturally? Among the varied interests of life, must religion alone remain undeveloped, uncivilized? Has it no inner essence capable of development, growth, refinement, just as science, literature, social and economic theory?

I

In view of these questions, the point recently raised again by Wobbermin's book, *The Nature of Religion*, seems eminently appropriate. But how shall we determine what religion is? Wobbermin mentions three methods, which he denominates the genetic, the religio-historical, and the method of the normative standard. Each of these he rejects as begging the question. For the first two do not enable one to know what is the aspect of experience whose genesis and history one is to trace. The third assumes as final a special type of religion, such as Christianity, and proceeds to measure all other religions by it.

For these, then, he substitutes the religio-psychological method, whose task he summarizes in the words: "The nature of religion must be that

fundamental underlying motive of religious life common to all forms of religious expression." But does not this statement equally beg the question? For what aspect of experience is to be called "religious" and to be taken as the object of investigation in order that its "underlying motive" may be laid bare? And what expressions are to be called "religious" that they may be grouped together and have the underlying motive of all of them revealed as their true essence?

We may readily agree with Wobbermin that in order to understand adequately any phase of experience we must not merely talk about it and see it from the outside. In order to understand art one must have the actual, immediate thrill of beauty. But one can analyze the content of such a field of interest only after the essential scope of the field itself has been defined. One cannot examine the inner structure of the field of science until one has a determining conception of what science undertakes to be. So, neither can one examine the attributes of religious experience until one knows which aspect of experience in general is to be defined as "religious." One might after all accumulate a vast amount of detail about certain practices, only to find that the field analyzed was not what anybody ever meant by religion. They might prove to be the initiatory rites of some fraternal organization or the particular technique of some school of art, rather than what people have referred to as religion.

II

There is a problem here about the use of terms which some would cast aside as merely verbal. Are not words the products of human convention and hence to be given any meaning we please? Is it not a matter of indifference whether one declares a word to mean one thing or another? So if calling a man "atheist" simply means that his conception of God has become more refined, and very likely more intelligent, than the traditional one, what difference does it make whether you call him an atheist or not? The important thing is what you mean by "atheism," and what kind of "atheist" he is. Even the early Christians were called atheists by the Romans because they would not engage in certain rites indicative of supreme respect and reverence toward the emperor, although atheism in the generally accepted sense is hardly a justified characterization of Christianity.

Now let us at once insist that the use of a word is not a matter of indifference, and verbal meanings are not assignable at will by individual choice. This is due to the very function of language. Its purpose is to

serve as an instrument of communication. As a social instrument for the purpose of effective mutual understanding and practical co-operation the meaning of a word is a super-individual matter, and cannot be handled loosely by individuals without thwarting the very purpose of language. It is an inconsistency to recognize that linguistic meanings are determined by social convention and then claim that these may be freely altered at the *individual's* preference without regard to social usage.

The first requisite of successful language is freedom from ambiguity. If a term changes meaning in the course of an individual's statement it is impossible to tell just what he means. His utterance then for all practical purposes becomes meaningless. And if two persons trying to converse use their terms in different senses they never succeed in getting together. Their remarks shoot past each other. Consequently they fail to build up a super-individual thought structure to which each makes a contribution, and which is the real aim of social converse. No scientist can enter discussion with a redefinition of established terms to suit his caprice. No lawyer can enter court and ignore vested meanings.

New technical scientific terms can have their meanings determined by conventional agreement, as they have no background of popular connotation. Thus "calorie," "erg," "dyne," are readily definable and can be kept continuously unambiguous. Non-technical terms are harder to pin down to definite and constant meanings, their range of application and the number of people using them being so much greater than in the case of the technical. But still, in proportion as even these words retain a constant meaning, in this proportion is the chance of mutual understanding increased.

Religious, ethical and social terms are depositories of civilization, and cannot be used without reference to these implicit loads of connotation which give background to their more explicit meanings. It is because of this tacitly implied background that it makes a vast social difference whether one is called atheist, socialist, and radical. One cannot irresponsibly redefine terms of long standing without doing injustice to those who have used them. It is therefore important in all exact thinking to take into account the original intention of the term and to adhere to it as far as possible, in order to avoid ambiguity and maintain continuity and objectivity of meaning.

III

Applying this method to the field of religion we may say it is impor-

tant to understand what the original intention of the term "religion" was, and to raise the question whether disputants have remained true to this intention.

The term was of course of Latin origin, occurring in the works of a number of Roman authors, and receiving its most explicit definition in the writings of Cicero. And in the thinking of Cicero it found its most distinctive meaning through a contrast with superstition. The *locus classicus* is his dialogue. *On the Nature of the Gods* (Bk. II, 28) where he says: "Religion has been distinguished from superstition, not only by the philosophers but by our ancestors." The derivation of the term "superstition" he rests upon the word "superstes" ("surviving"), and says, "Persons who spent whole days in prayer and sacrifice to ensure that their children should outlive them were termed 'superstitious,' a term which later got a much wider application." Modern philology is not always willing to accept the derivations of the Roman writers themselves; and in this case Cicero's theory is not to be accepted without question, although there is evidence elsewhere of the superstitious attitude of Romans in connection with their children. On the basis of its composition modern theory derives the word rather from its meaning to "stand over." This is better understood if we translate it "standing agape over," for it was used in situations where people were amazed or astounded over something. Both to ancients and moderns the heart of its meaning is to be found in the excess of fear and anxiety which it connotes. The characterizations predicated of it in other places in Cicero's works shows how consistently he condemned it. In one place he called it "old-womanish," in another "barbarous," in still another "empty"; it is associated with weak minds and with the practices of fortune-tellers. Disparaging adjectives are applied to it by other writers as well. Seneca characterizes it as "insane error"; Horace calls it "depressing," Tacitus "magical" and "deadly"; to Silius Italicus it was "vain"; Servius describes it as "excessive and mad fear." Thus superstition was generally considered a thing to be condemned.

Three hundred years before Cicero's time Theophrastus, the successor of Aristotle in the Lyceum at Athens, had made a very apt character sketch of the superstitious man, describing him as "the sort of person who begins the day only after he has sprinkled himself, washed himself with holy water, and taken a sprig of laurel in his mouth. If a weasel cross his path, he will not go a step farther until some one else has crossed, or until he has

thrown three stones over the way." Such an attitude is one of distrust of the powers that control the universe. To such the scheme of things entire is irrational and arbitrary; it is impossible to tell what it will do, and impossible to have any confidence in it. The superstitious mind is over-anxious about things because it cannot trust the powers that be. And because of this distrust it becomes fearful, over-sensitive, eccentric, irrational. It does all sorts of foolish things, engaging in absurd practices in the hope that by multiplying measures it may chance upon that which will please God.

Religion according to Cicero is different. "Those who on the other hand carefully considered and reconsidered all those things which pertain to the worship of the gods were called 'religiosi.'"

Two theories of the origin of the word were found. Cicero presents one when he derives it from "legere" ("to read") and regards it as meaning the retracing or rereading of the things which pertain to the worship of the gods. In this he seems to be followed in a passage by Aulus Gellius. But a second view connected it with "ligare" ("to bind"), held by Lucretius, Servius, Lactantius and Augustine. On the nature of this bondage, too, there were differences of opinion. For Lucretius took it to be a bondage which held men's mind down to beliefs from which they should be released; it was to this end that he advocated his atomistic materialism. But to other writers it meant a bond with something higher than man, to which the epithet "divine" is applied (Cicero, Lactantius). Religion from this point of view is what binds man to his obligations to the highest things he knows. "Obligare" is the chief derivative from "ligare." As such a bond religion is not a depressing but an elevating influence. It does have a restraining power; and so it is mentioned by Cicero along with law and custom as one of the things which act as agencies of order in society. He refers to the story of Numa Pompilius, the early king of Rome, who restrained the spirits of his people from their natural warlike tendencies by the ceremonies of religion. And in a fine passage in the introduction to the dialogue *On the Nature of the Gods* he says piety, reverence, and religion "are tributes which it is our duty to render in purity and holiness to the divine powers." "Piety, however, like the rest of the virtues, cannot exist in mere outward show and pretense; with the disappearance of piety, reverence and religion would also necessarily disappear. When these are gone life soon becomes a welter of disorder and confusion; and in all probability the disappearance

of piety toward the gods will entail the disappearance of loyalty and social union among men as well, and of justice itself, the queen of all the virtues."

Whatever may be the correct derivation of the word, at least it seems clear that there was a general sense of distinction between the animating motive of religion and of what was classed as superstition, which led Cicero in his essay *On Divination* to declare that the removal of superstition does not at the same time remove religion, and to observe further, "hence 'superstitious' and 'religious' came to be terms of censure and approval respectively."

Religion, in contrast with superstition, is based upon confidence in the universe, in its ultimate rationality and consequent fairness and justice. It is the reaction of a sane mind with the conviction that there is a possible and in many cases an actually achieved mutual understanding between the finite person and the Total System of the Real.

That religion should be defined by a thoughtful man like Cicero in terms of rationality is perhaps not surprising. But the fact that a thoughtful man could so define it affords refutation of the claim that religion can have no meaning to such a temperament. It also presents a fundamental difficulty in the way of the conceptions of Lucretius in Cicero's own day, and Hobbes, Hume and others down to the present, that religion is rooted in emotion in general, and specifically in the emotion of fear. Such a theory ignores the fact that although the Hebrew scriptures give the injunction, "Jehovah of hosts, regard him as holy; let him be your fear and your dread" (Isa. 8. 13), they also say, "What doth Jehovah thy God require of thee, but to fear Jehovah thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him" (Deut. 10. 12). The preaching of Hosea, and the whole doctrine of Christianity, are based on an emotion other than fear! Are these doctrines irreligious?

Furthermore, when we raise the question how far the Latin conception of religion as contrasted with superstition is conformable to Christian doctrine, it must be noted first of all that the Church Fathers (Lactantius, Augustine, Isidore, Thomas Aquinas) cited the Latin writers, and accepted the contrast suggested by them. The church has never consented to the accusation that its doctrines are identical with superstition. Mediæval tradition did not reject the use of reason. Its only question was regarding its adequacy. But as its final conviction it held there was no essential opposition between reason and faith.

In assuming this general position in theory it was merely perpetuating the doctrine of the Johannine literature, in which the same Christianity which says, "God so loved the world . . ." begins with the announcement, "In the beginning was Reason, and Reason was with God, and Reason was God . . . and this Reason became flesh and dwelt in our midst." The personality of the Christ was as much an incarnation of World Reason as of World Love and World Power. It was not until the influence of men like Tertullian and the mystics obscured this feature that the tradition of the church overemphasized the non-rational or superrational character of the doctrine. In the Logos (Reason) doctrine we have the apotheosis of that which the Latin writers employed to differentiate religion from superstition. And faithfulness to the essence of Johannine Christianity must imply first of all a confidence in the reasonableness of God, and an assurance that the pursuit of a reasonable course of life cannot be fundamentally at odds with man's final obligation. As Paul says, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable (*λογικὴν*) service."

The traditional view of religion is based too largely upon an attempt to define it in terms of the object of its interest. Hence any reaction to what has been taken as the Ultimate has been called religion. But this is as if one were to define physical science as any kind of reaction to the material world. This would obliterate entirely the distinction between magic and science, the methods and techniques of the primitive savage and of the effective thinker. Such a mingling of extremes in science is not permissible. Neither is the analogous mingling permissible in religion. As magic was a stage in the development of science, which had to be outgrown, so superstition was a preliminary step toward religion, beyond which unfortunately many minds have not gone.

IV

Now it is a fair question whether the church has been true to its intention to foster religion; whether it has not at many points gone astray and advocated what is really superstition, though applying to it the other name. We are justified in asking also what has led to this straying from the true path of religion. The church distrusts reason because even when reason is rightly used there are other aspects of experience with which it must be

supplemented, which are indispensable to the whole truth. Again, human analysis often goes wrong and is no infallible guide.

To the first objection it must be conceded that reason is not to be regarded as merely formal process, but rather as something which has also content furnished by action and feeling. Reasonableness is not merely something we think out but also something we live out. There are two kinds of action, and two kinds of feeling, rational and irrational. Religion is interested in rational action and rational feeling as contrasted with those which must be judged finally as irrational and foolish.

Analysis is often erroneous. But if this be taken as meaning that one must turn away from analysis to feeling for the final solution of problems, it must be said that the same accusation of possible error can be as legitimately raised against feeling and intuition. They also at times go astray, and hence are no more to be trusted than reason.

This possibility of error, both in analysis and intuition, necessitates the constant "re-view" of convictions, that we may know whether they stand the test of further experience and fresh analysis. Even alleged supernatural revelation is subject to a pragmatic and reflective test of the true and false, as indicated in Deuteronomy, chapter 18, "If thou say in thy heart, How shall we know the word which Jehovah hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken; the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him."

The church has often been superstitious. In many quarters it is superstitious still. It has been and is afraid to reconstruct its interpretations in the light of new experience and more fact. It has hesitated to abandon points of view and vocabulary of the past and speak the language of the present day. It has lacked confidence in its own honest efforts to live and to think in the immediate presence of the contemporary universe. It has somehow assumed that minds in the past were more competent to deal with ultimate problems, and that access to God was more open. It has lacked faith in a present communion with God, and has rejected its own tenet, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

To many of this present generation this fear seems unwarranted. What they propose therefore increasingly to do is to assert their confidence in a religion which will strive to embody reasonableness in theory and practice and which will bear out the original contrast of religion with superstition.

The Game of Science

L. W. TAYLOR

OF writers on the relation of scientific doctrine to Christian theology there is no end. If there were any lack of theologians who felt themselves competent to evaluate current scientific doctrine (which there is not), that lack would be abundantly compensated by the plethora of men of science who are making pronouncements on theological trends. We may all admit that there are numerous adjustments to be made between the two points of view, but we can be excused for entertaining a feeling akin to boredom whenever another "reconciler" appears on the horizon.

Yet in addition to the perfectly obvious facts that the problems in this field have not by any means been solved and that there is a general desire on the part of the thoughtful reading public for further light on the subject, there is at least one mode of approach to the situation which has not yet received adequate treatment. That is an open-minded and thoughtful *re-evaluation of scientific doctrine by men of science* in the light of current trends of thought toward both science and theology. Whatever may be said of attempted interpretations of science by men whose principal training is in theology (and some excellent work has unquestionably been done against such a background), there can be no doubt but that much confusion has been introduced into the case through theological pronouncements by prominent men of science. Whether it be a resuscitation of an outmoded post-Kantian dualism at the hands of Eddington, the hopelessly naïve conception of a creator who is primarily a mathematician in the mind of Jeans, or the caustic comments on a deity who tortures little children in Bertrand Russell's distortion of the problem of evil, all of these are examples of the consequences of failure on the part of men who are abundantly competent in their respective fields, to recognize the limits on their competence. Eddington, Jeans and Russell, in company with a number of others, are very stimulating writers. But unless the circulation of their works can be confined to those who are capable of reading with considerable discrimination, the waters of thought in this field are certain to be muddied considerably by their treatment.

We must recognize, of course, that there is no clear boundary between science and philosophy, between physics and metaphysics, especially in these days of relativity, the wave-theory of matter and Heisenberg's principle of indeterminacy. Ventures into the borderland, from either side, are necessary in the very course of the extension of knowledge. But more is lost than gained when the tentative formulations of doctrine incident to such ventures are prematurely submitted to the layman buttressed by the prestige of the writer acquired in a field other than that in which he is publishing.

In place of the general impression among the masses that only in scientific truth can complete validity be found, in place of an implicit feeling on the part of many men of science that the so-called scientific method is a second decalog which they are divinely appointed to administer, a spirit of self-criticism is growing in the sciences which is very encouraging. It is describable, perhaps, in what will seem at first to be a very curious metaphor.

In this metaphor the scientific enterprise may be likened to a game. Curiously enough, it is possible to find in the sciences, as indeed in most of the professions, illustrations of the basic conventions and ethics of sport. At first sight this seems rather absurd, for surely science is a serious pursuit, not a mere game. One feels that the triviality of the objectives of games makes the use of any such comparison misleading. Notwithstanding this natural feeling, if one penetrates deeply into the psychology of games and into the philosophy of the sciences, the metaphor will be found to have its uses.

It is of the essence of a game that an objective is rather arbitrarily set. To place a ball in a basket or between two particular posts, or within a certain area on the ground, or in a hole in the ground; each of these objectives occupies a central place in a particular game. No inquiry is made as to the value of these objectives. Superficially regarded, they are without value, to the point of triviality, yet no participant relaxes his efforts on that account.

It is a further characteristic of games that the objective may be reached only in particular rigorously prescribed ways. To give only one example, if putting the ball in the hole were the sole objective of golf, anyone could immediately qualify for the distinction of having made a "hole in one" by picking up the ball, walking to the green, and dropping it into the cup. But so important is the way it is done that the assertion would promptly be

made not only that such an individual was violating the rules but that he was not playing golf at all.

Two of the principal characteristics of games are, then, the purely arbitrary choice of an objective and rigorous limitation of the ways in which that objective may be realized. Before inquiring how far the sciences possess these same characteristics it will be profitable to consider some other professions.

It was frequently said of business tycoons of the last fifty years that they amassed wealth, not primarily because of desire for wealth, or even for what it could purchase, but because the mere act of amassing it had become a game with them, and there was much to support that theory. As between the possession of, say, a million dollars and the possession of a hundred million dollars, there is very little choice. The less wealthy of two such men still has enough to purchase all the personal comforts and security which the more wealthy could possibly imagine. If there is any difference between the degree of comfort which attends the possession of a million-dollar estate and that which attends a hundred million, it would not be at all in the hundred-to-one ratio of the estates. Indeed, the additional ninety-nine millions would unquestionably bring more cares and responsibilities than added comforts. Why, then, do men continue to struggle for added wealth after they have secured a competence? Simply because what was originally a means has become the end. They now seek wealth for no other reason than the stimulation which the pursuit of such an objective brings. In other words, they are simply playing a game.

There is food for thought in the theory that our whole legal structure is a vast schedule of games, the objectives of which are the winning of judicial decisions. No more attention is paid to the worthiness of the decision which is sought than to that of the placing of a ball in a cup. A lawyer works as eagerly to secure the acquittal of a man that he knows is guilty as of one that is innocent, and suffers no loss of professional prestige thereby. Moreover, the objective must be sought in particular, rigorously prescribed ways. And it is characteristic of some of these ways that they allow no cognizance to be taken of the truth unless it can be molded into certain forms. Such is the nature of legal technicalities.

The medical practitioner, too, is playing a game. He asks no questions about the value of his objective. It is his professional duty to save life, regardless of its value. He will labor as hard to save a criminal who is

ill as he will a statesman; and this would be true even if the criminal were to be executed the following day. Also, his professional ethics require that the objective be reached in particular, rigorously prescribed ways. He may not advertise, he may not solicit. It sometimes happens that a physician will allow a person not his patient to die rather than to call his attention to a cancerous growth, of the significance of which the victim is unaware. And the whole sorry story of warring medical sects is primarily a matter, not of relative effectiveness of different modes of treatment, but of scorn for players who fail to observe current arbitrary rules of the medical game.

There is a good deal to be said for the theory that the scientist, too, is the devotee of a game. He selects a certain type of objective. If he is a scientist, as distinguished from an inventor or engineer, he gives no consideration to the value of the objective. He accepts it uncritically from the general enterprise of which his profession is a part. The formulation and testing of hypotheses are as much the center of his professional life as is the amassing of wealth, the winning of decisions, or the saving of life to the other professions. The value of the hypotheses is as irrelevant as are the values of the corresponding objectives to the other professions. In the sciences as in the other professions, there are doubtless deviations from the code, but that such codes form the yardsticks of professional ethics there would seem to be little ground for doubt.

Not only do men of science accept objectives uncritically, as do other professions, but they too must pursue their objectives in particular, rigorously prescribed ways. The central point in the professional ethics of the scientist is mechanical causation. If a physical scientist sees a fire in a grate, he may take professional cognizance only of the chemical reactions and the heat transfers. He may say that the cause of the evolution of heat is the exothermic combination of oxygen with certain hydrocarbons. He is excluded from accounting for the heat on the basis of having touched a match to kindling accumulated for the purpose, and still more from accounting for it on the basis of having desired that the room should be warm. Yet from the standpoint of most human relations, the latter is the real *raison d'être* of the fire, a fact, however, which many scientists will not admit unless caught off of their professional guard.

It is to be noted that there are alternative ways of accounting for the existence of the fire, or of "explaining" it. Only three explanations were listed above, but there might have been others. Indeed, in theory,

there are always an infinite number of possible explanations for any given phenomenon. But the rules of the game of science eliminate all explanations involving any element of purpose or design, and so delimit the explanations that are left that in practice there is seldom more than one scientific explanation of a phenomenon. Even in the cases in which it is impossible for a time to choose between two or more explanations, the alternatives are always mechanical, that is, non-purposive. The exclusion of all causal sequences except the mechanical is the characteristic feature of scientific doctrine, much as the exclusion of all methods of controlling a ball except with a racquet is the characteristic feature of tennis. It would be possible to catch the tennis ball by hand, walk to the net and drop it over, but the players agree to exclude that and all other ways of handling the ball except by the racquet. The man of science, too, in playing *his* game, agrees to bar all types of treatment of his data except mechanical causation. To work in other ways would of course be possible, but by common agreement such other ways are not to be considered a part of the game of science. This deserves emphasis, for it seems not to be comprehended as generally as it should be, even in scientific circles. The exclusive use of mechanical sequences in scientific theory is simply the principal rule of the scientific game. It does not mean at all that, in "explaining" a fire in a grate, the man of science must necessarily deny the validity of purposive types of explanation, though in practice he frequently becomes guilty of doing so. Such slips, however, are traceable to human frailty and are not an integral part of basic scientific doctrine.

One of the implications of the self-imposed limitation to mechanical causation on the part of the sciences is the recognition of the circumscribed nature of scientific doctrine, even, in a certain sense, its triviality. But at this point we must move warily. It does not follow that the limitations on scientific validity indicate the abandonment of that type of approach to knowledge. On the contrary, this tagging of different types of sequence of events has proved to be of the essence of the progress of our intellectual enterprise. It cannot be commended too warmly nor used too intensively. Discrimination between the different types is a measure of the clarity of one's thought. It may be completely demonstrable, for example, that the success of a business man is primarily due to the active support of a group of friends who possess great affection for him. But even if he were fully aware of the fact, he would be aghast at any suggestion that the love of his

friends should be entered as an asset on his balance sheet. Upon pursuing this apparent paradox to its depths, we should discover that bookkeeping operations really constitute a game, the rules of which permit the listing of only certain types of asset. The only legitimate conclusion from such an attitude is that the business man's balance sheet tells only a part of the economic story. Similarly, the scientist's balance sheet tells only a part of the scientific story.

In his essay entitled "Gallio, or the Tyranny of Science" Sullivan says "Moral and æsthetic values are as much a part of the real universe as anything else. The reason why science does not find it necessary to mention them is not because they are not there, but because science is a game, played according to certain rules, and those rules have excluded values from the outset."

It is one of the merits of the "game" doctrine of science that it lends itself almost perfectly to a description of the abstractive method, the very heart of scientific strategy. To illustrate the abstractive method of science, consider the technical term "efficiency." Mechanical efficiency is defined as the ratio of the useful work accomplished by a machine to the total effort expended upon it. For example, an eight-hundred-pound elevator carries a two-hundred-pound man. The total effort is proportional to the sum of the two weights, or a thousand pounds. The useful work accomplished is the raising of the two-hundred-pound man. The efficiency is the ratio of two hundred to a thousand or twenty per cent. Now suppose the man's errand were merely to carry upstairs a piece of paper weighing, say, an ounce. The efficiency of the process is then the ratio of an ounce to a thousand pounds, one part in sixteen thousand, or a disappearingly small fraction of one per cent.

Suppose that the paper were a telegram that changed the whole course of the life of the individual to whom it was delivered. Is the efficiency of the elevator episode still the same small fraction of one per cent? It is. Or, to carry the same theme to its natural conclusion, suppose the man to be delivering a verbal message which, of course, weighs nothing at all. Is the efficiency of the process zero, regardless of the major consequences that might follow the delivery of the message? There is nothing in the definition of efficiency that provides for an estimate of the *value* of the load carried by the elevator. The only thing that counts is its weight. Is the scientist so stupid therefore as to insist that the *real significance* of the

elevator trip is to be expressed by a ridiculously small fraction of one per cent or even zero? Not at all. The answer to the paradox is simply that physics has ruled out all consideration of significances in the definition of efficiency. The only features of the elevator trip in which the physicist can be expected to take a professional interest are the measurable ones. He does not deny the value of the message on the paper, but that he cannot measure. It is outside of the class of phenomena that he is willing to study in his science.

Perhaps more illustrative of the abstractive method of science is the definition of the very fundamental concept called work. According to the elementary definition of work as force times distance, the executive and the scholar are the world's greatest loafers. The product of any forces that they may exert by accompanying distances through which they move, bears no relation whatever to the effectiveness of their intellectual efforts. In fact, Benedict of the Carnegie Institution carried out last year the first reliable measurement of the physical work involved in mental labor. His conclusion was that it was substantially zero. The maid who dusts Einstein's desk, the janitor who sweeps Roosevelt's office, are each doing measurable work at a rate more than twenty times as great as that which their principals reach at moments of deepest concentration.

This does not imply any lack of value in the labors of Einstein or Roosevelt. It simply illustrates the folly of trying to apply scientific concepts to regions which the sciences have themselves excluded from their domain.

There is in physics an interesting division of natural events into reversible and irreversible processes. Compressing a spring or lifting a weight, or performing any other act, which when reversed can be made to yield back the energy expended, are called reversible processes. Work done in this way is termed useful work. On the other hand, energy expended in sliding a box across the floor is irretrievably lost, dissipated into heat through friction. Such a process is of course irreversible and is termed non-useful work. It will be evident that the adjectives "useful" and "non-useful," when used in this connection, are really technical terms which are not to be identified with the broader non-technical uses of the same words. But suppose now, that a physicist should forget those self-imposed limitations on his terminology, and though he willingly paid a red-cap ten cents for carrying his suitcase upstairs because the act involves useful work, should

refuse to pay him for carrying it from one place to another at the same level, on the contention that the work in the latter instance had been non-useful. The physicist would merely have made his science ridiculous because he had lost sight of the very limitations which he had himself placed upon it at the outset. He would be in much the same position as a golfer who had become so enamored of the putter as a useful instrument on the golf course that he insisted on using it to putt sugar-lumps into his coffee.

The fact is that in pursuit of the abstractive strategy of science, men of science often objectify their concepts into forms which bear little relation to the commonalities of the workaday world. That can be justified by the fact that armed with those concepts they can frequently accomplish things that are beyond the capacity of the workaday world. But it would be a sad mistake for them to identify their abstracted technical terminology with the similarly-named but often utterly different concepts of everyday life. Yet one may wonder whether it is not precisely this error into which some biologists, in their insistence that all life processes are exclusively physico-chemical, are precipitating themselves. They forget their own primary self-imposed limitations. Life is physico-chemical only in the sense in which the same can be said of a fire in the grate. To denominate the fire as *exclusively* physico-chemical is to lose sight of the possibility of alternative explanations such as the purpose of heating the room, which may in fact possess a much greater degree of validity for the non-technical mind. And to denominate life as exclusively physico-chemical is simply to ignore most of the processes which are really characteristic of life.

Similarly, those men of science who, on the basis of their study of psychology, assert that man is merely a bundle of reflexes, that humanity can exercise no choice and possess no freedom of action, and who even assert that it is possible to account for all human behavior without taking the agency of mind into account, are simply doing the same thing that a physicist would be doing if he should refuse to pay a red-cap because his work was non-useful, or that a golfer would do in using his putter at the dining table, or that a chemist would do in asserting that in accounting for a fire on the basis of chemistry he had ruled out the possibility of its having been built for the purpose of warming the room. Such psychologists are applying to the workaday world technical terms which are simply inapplicable by virtue of the very limitations which their science itself has estab-

lished. Choice, freedom of action, mind, has each its own meaning in the psychological laboratory, and each a different meaning outside of the laboratory. It may be doubted whether competent psychologists are ever guilty of the muddy thinking that would be involved in confusing these two meanings. But they *do* frequently neglect to caution their readers and their audiences against the possibility of such confusion, with the result that their science is frequently misrepresented.

The extent to which *physical* scientists take their own abstractions from "reality" with a liberal sprinkling of salt seems not to be generally recognized, nor its implications realized. For example, hydrodynamics is the mathematical theory of the behavior of weightless and frictionless fluids which have the property of being created out of nothingness in unlimited quantities at points technically called sources and shrinking into nothingness at points called sinks. This curious set of concepts violates some of the fundamental doctrines of physical science itself, yet the physicist does not become excited about that. He is playing a game with these concepts much as one might play a game with a jig-saw puzzle. The physicist is not particularly concerned with the obvious absurdities of his pursuit, nor is he particularly elated when the hydraulic or the aeronautical engineer finds some new application of the subject of hydrodynamics as he occasionally does.

Again, the game of paralleling the old wave-theory of light by alternative "explanations" on the quantum theory has proven to be a very absorbing one. Some physicists have played the wave game and some the quantum game, but more have played both. Until quite recently it was common for the same teacher to account for the behavior of light on the basis of its wave properties in one course, and on the basis of its quantum or 'flying particle' properties in another course. As one academic wag put it, "Light is wave-motion on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and is a stream of bullets on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays."

Comment has already been made on the arbitrary, even artificial nature of the physicist's concept of work. The same curious paradox is found in the physicist's definition of intensity of sound. According to this concept a sound which according to the physicist's measurement is thousands of times as intense as another, may be actually less loud, judged by the sensation produced in the normal ear. Again, the physicist regularly deals with electric and magnetic lines of force which he would be the first to insist are

merely convenient fictions, and one of his favorite pursuits is measuring the lengths of waves of an ether whose very existence is one of the perennial questions of physics. All these are examples of the central scientific strategy of abstractions from total experience. The physicist abstracts certain measurable aspects from the mass of material furnished by his senses and proceeds to apply his technique of measurement, largely without attention to any relation that his work may bear to the total situation out of which he has abstracted his material. Belonging to one of the oldest sciences he has had time to realize that these abstractions are often silly if he allows himself to forget that he is merely playing a game. But the newer sciences, like inexperienced players, often take their games too seriously, forgetting that in the interests of proper human perspectives they must drop many of their scientific concepts when they leave the laboratory. Joseph Needham, an English biologist, has phrased it well in the statement "In science we have to act as if mechanism were true, even though we may really believe it is not;" and again "Materialism . . . is the only philosophy upon which science can get to work; methodologically it is essential. And if I do not believe in it for a moment as a man, I recognize its fundamental importance as an experimentalist."

Two more aspects of this "game" doctrine of science may receive brief consideration. For the first, since it is one of the corollaries of this doctrine that no cognizance may be taken of the relation between the objectives of science and the objectives of real life, the two sets of objective will naturally occasionally become incompatible. Examples outside of the field of science are easy to find. The game played by the industrialist has involved economic fallacies that have nearly wrecked his own playground. It is one of the objects of the New Deal, however imperfectly realized, to change the rules of that game for the better. The legal game has been played in ways so damaging to even its own interests that the legal profession itself is insisting that the rules be changed. The medical game has blocked the very progress of medicine at a number of outstanding points. In all these instances a broader perspective has become mandatory not only for the welfare of society, but for the preservation of the integrity of the professions themselves.

It is a fair question whether the scientific profession is, or even should be, immune from this trend. One does not need to be deeply impressed with diatribes against a soulless science which is alleged to be destroying the

flower of culture, nor even with such assertions as the recent one of Secretary Wallace that the sciences are on the high road to self-destruction. But the game theory points definitely in that direction and suggests a candid self-examination. Other types of intellectual enterprise have been wiped, out by popular reaction, even though society committed intellectual suicide for a period of centuries in the process.

Nor is the socialization or "gleichschaltung" of science a necessary or desirable alternative. Rather than accept that, it would be better for science to accept extinction as the penalty for remaining stiff-necked. The outcome of such processes is seen in the fact that economists discover in Italian official statistics conclusive evidence of falsification at the source, in the presence of frequent laudatory comments about Lenin in the middle of Russian reports on investigations in physics, inserted as the price of the privilege of publication, and in the tragedy of the German scholars who have prostituted their professions as the price of not being "displaced." And yet, after all the objections that a conservative profession can make to broadening its horizon have been made, the question may still be asked whether the sciences are wise in choosing the objectives of their game without reference to social values.

But there is a final implication of the "game" theory which seems even more significant than any of the foregoing. It is sometimes said that the one point of contact of science with the world of values is at the point of truth; that the point of scientific departure is the search for truth and that every other consideration must give way before this one. While there is reason to think that this is somewhat of an oversimplification, and that science can be seen to have other points of contact with the world of values, than in its search for truth, it is rather the other side of the picture that is stressed here. Identifying science with the search for truth, so far from saying too little, says too much. It is not truth in its more general manifestations that science seeks, but only particular aspects of truth, and that only in particular ways.

It is a part of the doctrine of current science to confine attention to mechanical causation. Having determined in advance that we shall consider only that type of sequence of events, there is no great significance in the fact that our scientific conclusions embody no other factor. Francis Bacon in his *Novum Organum* tells the story of a man brought into a temple filled with portraits of those who had paid their vows before going to sea

and had not been drowned. Upon being asked to acknowledge the power of the gods he replied, "Aye, but where are they painted who were drowned after their vows?" Bacon supplements the story by observing "Men mark when they hit and never mark when they miss."

Bear in mind that the search for truth is also an objective of our system of jurisprudence. And yet, to our way of thinking, the legalistic approach to truth is capable of eliciting only a distorted picture of a small portion of the truth. Our interpretation of the blindfold on the eyes of justice would not be confined to its symbolism of the avoidance of partisanship and wishful thinking. Yet the almost worshipful faith of some lawyers in our system of law as an instrument for the discovery of truth is very impressive. The writer recently heard a very successful lawyer, with fifty years of experience, remark on a case that had been settled out of court, expressing doubt as to the truth of the facts upon which the contending parties had agreed. He regretted that the case had not been submitted to the operation of what he called "the judicial mind," feeling that he could then have regarded the findings with greater confidence. Yet if there is a judicial mind, to possess any value as a method of establishing truth even in law, it must be something larger than a skill in juggling the dialectic subtleties of courtroom procedure; something possessed by many not legally trained.

The legal profession has no monopoly on intellectual provincialism. All that is necessary is to listen to a man of science refer to "the scientific method." He will almost certainly use much the same tone of voice as the foregoing attorney used when he said "the judicial mind."

Now the scientific method, if there is such a thing, must be something larger than laboratory skill and a technical vocabulary if it is to possess any value even in the sciences. It must be something possessed by many not scientifically trained. Hence, to such a degree as one has confidence in the validity of the scientific method, he is bound to respect the conclusions of properly qualified workers on other aspects of the phenomena with which the sciences deal. It is no less an obligation and a privilege of those workers to cultivate an intelligent interest in the scientific method and candidly to consider the lessons which it drives home.

In the words ascribed by Goethe to the Devil:

Do but despise reason and science,
The highest of man's powers,
And thou art mine for sure!

Institution or Movement?

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

SO much fault is being found nowadays with the church, that one wonders whether in any earlier time there has been anything like this volume of criticism. So far as I know, no research student has yet investigated this question. Guessing is therefore in order. I venture to suppose that the church has always been under heavy fire. But it seems safe to say that the type of criticism has changed of late. Angry revolt and venomous abuse are an old story. An attitude of contempt and indifference, as if the church were played out and no longer counted, seems to be a new story. It is a story which many are telling to-day.

It is not a true story, and we know it. The church is not played out. It does still count. And it counts in the lives of plenty of intelligent people, whatever the sophisticates may pretend. Nevertheless, the faults in the church which they point out may be in a measure real faults. We should be dangerously complacent if we did not feel that we could learn from all our critics. From what they say we may get suggestions which will help us see what the church ought to be. Like astute politicians, loyal churchmen do well to keep one ear to the ground. We shall understand ourselves better, and be able to define our aims more clearly, if we hear what other people think of us.

Now of course there is no such specific fact as the church. There are many churches, but there is no one church on earth, in the inclusive sense. The church may be real, in that God may see all churches as in essence one. But what God sees is often hidden from the eyes of men. And a reality becomes a fact only when it becomes visible to human eyes. So, when people talk about the church, for or against, it would appear that they are talking about something non-existent.

This very fact, that the churches are not one but many, and are sometimes more concerned about differences among themselves than about the difference between the church and the world, is often adduced as evidence that organized religion is ineffectual and without serious weight. But I have never been one to waste much time deploring the absence of organic unity among Christians. Perhaps, indeed, there would be advantages in the

reunion of all the churches, which so many of our brethren pursue as their ideal. But there would certainly also be disadvantages. One of them might be that the united church would move as one man in all matters of public order and civic debate, under the regimentation of its clergy, so that the commonwealth would be subject to dictation by a disciplined majority of its citizens, made up of church members. But such dictation would amount to the setting up of a theocracy. And theocracy inevitably involves coercive pressure upon dissenters in the supposed interest of religion. Yet when religion employs coercion it ceases to be religion. Persuasion is the proper method of religion, because persuasion, not coercion, is God's own way with man. So long as the churches remain separate, they are under the necessity of following God's way, instead of the downgrade path of sheer power, which unification would make possible. Separation tempered by good feeling, mutual courtesy, and friendly agreement as to points of public policy held in common, will probably work out better in the long run toward bringing about a kingdom of God on earth, than if a kingdom of overwhelming influence through political patronage were set up for any conceivable united Christian hierarchy, no matter how high its motives or how sound its judgment.

When people find fault with the church, however, they are not usually employing the term with any hypothetical specific reference, but in a generic sense. When the critics with whom we are chiefly engaged speak of the church, they mean the average Protestant evangelical congregation. And the word has legitimate and recognizable meaning in that connection. We may not like to admit it; but, broadly speaking, it is true that over a wide range of denominations, leaving out the humanists on one side and the fundamentalists on the other, most churches are very much alike. They are alike psychologically, even when they differ considerably in doctrines, politics, and forms of worship, and are disposed to dispute about their differences to the extent of overlooking their actual similarity. The minds of their members work in about the same way, though it be within contrasting traditions and to varying conclusions. There certainly is such a thing, then, as the church—that is, a typical church. And in a general way, despite all the reasons we think we have for particular pride, my church, your church, is it. It is about our church that the critics are talking when they find fault with the church.

Who are they, and what do they say? There are two kinds of critics,

outside and inside. Suppose we take the outside critics first. The outside critics say, for one thing, that the church is made up largely of stuffily respectable people—people who behave conventionally, or who feel that they ought to behave conventionally and pretend that they do, without doing very much thinking, and with nothing heroic about them—with nothing in them that is appealing to younger people who have initiative, enterprise, independent minds, and a state for novelty.

Again, the outside critics say that the church has fixed ideas about doctrine, in a day when knowledge on all subjects is expanding as it has never done before. They say that the church has standards of orthodoxy which would bind believers to discredited superstitions, and which no informed and thoughtful person could accept without stultifying himself. They say that most church people hold not so much to the fixed ideas to which the church would commit them, as to fixed words which sound orthodox, and which they mistake for ideas, so that they can be easily fooled if someone will take the trouble to use those same words with another meaning, etymologically just as justifiable, but theologically at complete variance, perhaps, with the whole accepted connotation of the terms in church usage. So it may happen that a preacher will be denounced as a heretic if he uses a new word for an old idea, while he would not only get by but be applauded for his soundness if he used an old word for a new idea.

Further, the outside critics say that the church is satisfied with old ways of doing things—of administering its business, conducting its services, running its societies, and all the rest—just because they are old ways. Whatever is customary is on that account sacrosanct. Ugly buildings with bad ventilation and no conveniences, tasteless music, slipshod ritual, stale modes of social fellowship—the church does not dislike these things, the church positively prefers them because they have been inherited from the elders, and make no demands for originality and adaptability.

So say the outside critics. Some of them have not been long outside; and the more recent their exit from the church, the more scornful is their indictment. What a grotesque and unlovely institution the church must be, to be sure, if all that they say is true! They are certain of their facts, moreover. But are their facts certain? That is a different matter.

Beyond question, there is a good deal in what they say. We all recognize the stuffy people from their description; and there are a good many of them in most congregations. We are all familiar with the obstinate

clinging to preconceived notions about religion, whether they chime in with new-found truth or not; with the words that sound orthodox even on a heretic's lips, and which would be omitted at the preacher's peril even from an orthodox discourse. And we have had experience, to our sorrow perhaps, of the monstrous difficulty of achieving changes in procedure or equipment against the ingrained opposition of some of our most dependable Christian associates, who can see no reason why anything should ever be done in any way in which they happen never to have done it before. Yet, granting all this, how much of the story does it tell?

It tells everything except the significant part. Like some people when they repeat a funny story, our outside critics leave out the point. Most of what they say about the church could be repeated without change, save for verbal adaptations, concerning any institution whatever which draws its constituents from all ages, and many different grades of mentality. Political parties, alumni associations, societies of stamp collectors, all are tarred with this same brush of inherent conservatism. But most socialists—and socialists are supposed to be very wide-awake people—think catch-words instead of thoughts, and like to hark back to the example and outlook of the fathers of their system, without too much regard for the changed situation of the sons. And yet things do move. Leaders are found, and are backed up by compact alert minorities with vision and drive, to circumvent objections, make new views and plans popular, and get them translated into fact.

Things move in politics. They move in educational circles. They move just about as fast in the church. Any outside critic who supposes that a Congregational Church, for instance, is to-day about as it was a century ago, is leaving nothing out of his picture except the abandonment of Calvinism, the discovery of the Social Gospel, the advent of the era of Parish Houses, and the introduction of liturgical usages, with perhaps a few minor and accessory developments which I have overlooked. An 1834 Congregationalist in a 1934 Congregational church wouldn't know where he was at. Despite all obstacles in itself and the circumstances, the church does go ahead.

This gives occasion to point out a truth which is essential to our attempt to understand the rôle of the church in this new day. We have observed that as an institution the church suffers, like all other institutions, from a pull toward the static, the unchanging. It resists that pull, but it has to

change slowly because the pull is there. When an institution of any sort succumbs to that pull, and becomes static, unchanging, it dies. For wherever there is life there is motion. Sometimes, as in an oyster and the Roman Church, the motion is invisible to the naked eye; but it is there. Put it this way: every surviving institution is a movement; and every organized movement is incorporated in some institution. Nevertheless the concepts of institution and movement are antithetic. An institution, as such, wants to stand still. It would rather fall over than get a move on. What it actually longs for is the grave. But a movement seeks advance. It is not a tableau, but a procession. What it longs for is to get there. Where? Somewhere in particular, perhaps; but at any rate anywhere but here. Now how ought we to think of the church: as primarily an institution, and therefore moving with reluctance; or as primarily a movement, institutionalized in changing forms from time to time for mere temporary convenience?

Here lies a basic contrast between Catholicism and Protestantism. Catholicism aims at being an institution. It does move; it has to, now and then. It has even been known to reverse itself on some subjects. But when it moves, it does so surreptitiously. It is acting against its principles, and is ashamed of itself. Protestantism, on the other hand, aims at being a movement. Some of its ecclesiasts from the first have been institutionally-minded. Nevertheless it was born out of rapidly changing social conditions four hundred years ago in the awakening North of Europe, and there has always been a drive in it akin to the drive in the new business classes which have been most closely associated ever since with its development. Its symbol is not Simon Stylites on his pillar, but the Pilgrim on his Progress. For most of us there is a temperamental reason, deeper than any in the realm of theology, for being Protestants. We believe in action. We want to go places and do things. So for us the church is primarily a movement. The more thoughtful among us worry very little about mere matters of form and constitution. We judge the church by its aim. If it is going forward, we can put up with its faults on the way.

What did Jesus intend, an institution or a movement? Some of his words sound institutional. Rome founds the Petrine primacy upon a phrase which recalls the parable of the house builded upon rock: "Upon this rock I will build my church." Houses built on rock stand still. Paul echoes the idea: "Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." But

do such words represent Jesus' real intention? He died in penalty for his outspoken hostility to the rigid institutionalism of the Church of Israel. He and his disciples were always on the go. He bade them, "Go ye into all the world." And he was constantly pointing ahead to a goal which the movement they inaugurated was to reach: "Thy kingdom come . . . on earth." He was as little interested in things as they are for what they are to-day; as much interested in things as they shall be, as any man who ever lived. He named his band "apostles"—men sent away from home—not "bishops," settled overseers of an establishment. It was a movement, not an institution, which he and they together started; under such a leader, it could have been nothing else. In another passage Paul catches this subtler idea. Writing to the church at Corinth, he says, "Ye are the body of Christ." A body is not a corpse. A corpse stays put. A body moves. The church is a living organism, set in the world to pioneer in new territory and to bring new things to pass.

So much for the outside critics. We admit cheerfully that most of the things they say are true, as far as they go. We owe them a debt of gratitude for setting in a clear light these flaws in the church as an institution. For by looking into them we have been brought to a definition of the nature of the church, which is pregnant with suggestions as to the way in which it should be managed. It is to be conducted, not administered. For it is a movement, not an institution. Its institutional phases are purely adventitious and instrumental. We could scrap every order of the ministry, every denominational board, every accustomed method of ecclesiastical procedure, and improvise new ones in their stead, without hurting the church, provided the movement continued. Whether it would be worth while to do so or not is open to serious question, of course. The same old errors and abuses, incidental to every movement in its institutional or static aspect, would be pretty sure to recur before long, in connection with the new rules of organization. So perhaps we might as well carry on, in the main, with the old. Nevertheless, when once this vital concept of the church reigns in our minds—that it is a moving body, not a stationary house—we shall have a fresh and invigorating sense of our basic independence of mere precedents and regulations. It is we who use them for a living purpose, not they which govern us to preserve a deadening conformity to the outgrown past.

Now a word about the inside critics. They are found chiefly among

the younger clergy, with a few lay satellites. These high-minded, hot-blooded youngsters, true Christians most of them in the finest sense of ardent devotion to what they believe to be the ideals of Jesus for human welfare, need no one to tell them that the church is by rights a movement. But they are impatient of its slowness. They feel that it takes about one step in ten years, when it ought to travel the whole road right away. They will not be content to travel at a snail's pace. They want us to put more zip into this business of making the world better; to step out ahead of the times, instead of keeping pace with them.

These inside critics have my sympathy. I often feel like that myself. But, before we follow them at the breakneck speed they demand, let us be sure that they know whither they are headed, and that Christ really does lead on before. Where do they want us to go? Their reply is deafening. They do not hesitate to speak up. But mere loudness would not deafen us, if they were all shouting the same thing. The trouble is that they seem to have quite different ideas among themselves as to the destination; all they are agreed upon is that we ought to go somewhere in a hurry. Upon analysis, however, perhaps there is more unanimity than at first appears. For most of them, though with emphasis upon diverse elements of the program, are advocating that the church come out strongly for some form of socialism.

Now I have not a word to say against socialism as an ideal. But in its present form as an intellectual system it does not satisfy me. It is a good deal too intellectual, for one thing; doctrinaire rather than practical. For another, its premises include various abstractions which are of questionable validity. For another, it is new, as history measures the age of a school of thought; it has never yet been tried practically and thoroughly, in any Christian spirit. For another, it is neither the first, nor likely to be the last, of social schemes which would fit in fairly well with the social principles of Jesus. Even feudalism would have done so equally well, perhaps, if it had lived up to its ideal. For yet another, it is tied up with an atheist crowd at its left wing who are just as antagonistic to Christian philosophy and ethics as any capitalists, and more outspoken about it. Perhaps I am a coward; but it seems like common sense, to prefer to go slowly and make sure before we commit the church to a socialist crusade, though I am prepared to go one step at a time in commitment to proposals for social improvement which are susceptible of socialistic interpretation.

I cannot get it out of my mind that the church is not simply a living body; it is the body of Christ. And it seems to me that there is a good deal in that old saying of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and forever." We advance to a new understanding of him from time to time. He is still far ahead of us. We have a long way to go before we overtake him. He is more modern than the most modern. But it is always the same Christ whom we are seeking to understand. Whenever a new idea is put forward about him, we must try it out to make sure that it is true, and not just a vagrant notion, before we accept it.

The idea that Jesus was in the first instance a social reformer looks pretty dubious to me. I do not mean to suggest that he would be indifferent to reform, or any less indignant than we with any who should stand stubbornly in the way of manifest human justice. But it seems to me that his business was chiefly with men and women one by one, not in the mass. He sought to bring them individually into a transfiguring consciousness of their relationship with the Most High God. The transformation would not be complete, to be sure, until they began to reflect his eternal character in their temporal conduct as good neighbors and good citizens, zealous for positive righteousness in every relation and region of life. But it was a timeless message, not a time-table or a blueprint for rebuilding the structure of human affairs, which he was first of all concerned to give to mankind. We preachers are his heralds, to carry that message to the people of our day. When they act on that message, they will move in the direction of social reform, beyond a doubt. But it is not for us to tell them exactly what they must do, after they have received the message. They must work that out, as to the details, for themselves. And in doing so they are responsible to God whose message it is, not to God's spokesmen who delivered it.

Do you see what I am driving at? I conceive of the subject-matter of Christian faith as being changeless; for our faith is in Christ Jesus as the revelation of God. I conceive of the Christian Church as primarily a movement of thought toward the recognition of Jesus. If he is to be recognized more clearly and more generally, he must be seen imaginatively, with unchanged character from his Galilæan days, in contact and contrast with the swiftly shifting circumstances of every new age. I conceive of social reform as a business of the Christian laity, in close touch with current living, under the impulse imparted by an increasingly clear understanding of the heart

and purpose of Jesus. I am not denying the social gospel; but I am protesting against the mistaken impression that the social gospel, so variously interpreted, is the gospel itself. I believe that the business of the church is to move forward chiefly along two lines: in appreciation of Christ, with new terms and new thought-forms whenever necessary to bring our comprehension of him up to date, whether tradition would smile on them or not; and in extension of his reign over the hearts of men, by bringing the consciousness of God, as Jesus shows him forth, effectively to their minds. When Jesus reigns over men's hearts, he will soon dominate society also, whether through socialism or some other scheme more judicious and practicable, if such there be, for the improvement of earth-conditions.

The church is a movement. Every movement must have a leader. Under Christ, the leader of a church is its minister. The minister is to serve his own people, and as many more as he can reach, in the very spirit of Jesus. He can serve them by being their loyal friend and confidential counselor, by directing them in group activities which develop or fortify character, by teaching them, and no doubt especially, in these trying times, by educating their consciences in a conviction of social duty. But let the minister beware of becoming a mere pulpiteer. Let the pulpiteer beware of becoming a mere pamphleteer, dealing in temporary opinions upon temporary issues to the exclusion of the timeless message, the abiding truth in a changing world, which is the motor of Christian advance. Such opinions have their place, even in the pulpit, as tentatively illustrative of the truth incarnate in Christ; but never as dogmas taking its place.

The church is not an institution, save by accommodation. It moves slowly, because it must carry all of its people with it if it would succeed in its campaign—even the stuffily respectable; and because it has to make sure of its direction—a wrong turning on to a false route would be disastrous. Its objective is to understand Jesus, as he has never yet been understood, and to win mankind for his allegiance. In this new day, the church is still moving. Like all historic trends, it must preserve its continuity with the past if it would not be denatured. Like all trends incorporate in institutions, it has many handicaps and encumbrances. But it has made great strides in recent decades, and the way is opening up ahead. This is not a day for despair concerning the Christian movement, but for gratitude that we have won much ground, and for confidence that as we follow on in the Master's steps we are now on the eve of unprecedented progress.

The Soviets Look at Uncle Sam

JULIUS F. HECKER

THIS year's May-day parade on the Red Square in Moscow was made memorable by the presence of an honorable foreign guest, a guest such as had not been seen in the diplomat's box since the establishment of the worker's Soviet Republic nearly eighteen years ago.

It was the Hon. William Bullitt, United States Ambassador to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, who was the attraction. As the flood of paraders swept hour after hour through the huge square, the eyes of many tens of thousands sought and easily discovered the modest yet stately figure of the United States Ambassador. Literally, the people of the Soviets were looking at Uncle Sam and he was looking at them, for William Bullitt, be it said to his honor, did not leave the Red Square until the last column of workers had waved their red banners before Lenin's tomb. This in itself is quite unprecedented among foreign diplomats in Moscow, who usually leave the square after the military parade has passed and rarely stay to greet the workers' demonstration.

A fortnight later, at the occasion of the opening of the summer season of the great Moscow Park of Culture and Rest, the American Ambassador quite unexpectedly appeared on the scene to watch the people at their leisure. Soon it was whispered about that William Bullitt was in the park and a huge crowd of some twenty thousand working people sought him out, cheering enthusiastically. They would not stop till he finally rose to make his bow to the people. Here again the Soviets had been looking at Uncle Sam. Never within the memory of the Red Capital has a representative of a foreign power been received so warmly, so sympathetically; for the Moscovites, as a rule, pay not the least attention to foreign diplomats. Rarely does anyone outside of official circles know them by name, and no one cares to know; but the name of William Bullitt has become familiar even to school children. The personal democratic qualities of the American Ambassador have no doubt contributed to his popularity, but by no means does this wholly account for the spontaneous outbursts and the genuine sympathy felt for this foreign representative. It is meant not only for William Bullitt, it is addressed to Uncle Sam.

If we look for reasons for this unusual attitude toward a foreign power, we may be able to find the answer in examining the past of American Russian relations and the present world situation in which the United States and the USSR seem to be called by history to maintain the peace of the world. There is also some kinship in the psychology of these two great frontier peoples of the East and the West which makes them gravitate toward each other. All this in spite of the apparently irreconcilable differences of their respective social orders, the one representative of supercapitalism and the other of a one hundred per cent socialism.

RETROSPECT OF RUSSIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Russian-American friendship dates back to the very inception of the United States as an independent nation. When in 1776 England attempted to induce Russia to join in an intervention against the revolting American colonies, she refused to have anything to do with it. The first American diplomatic agent to Russia was Francis Dana, commissioned by the United States Congress to go to Russia to seek recognition. Landing in Saint Petersburg, he was received most cordially by the Russian government which offered its services to mediate between England and the United States. This service was readily accepted by the Americans. The Russians also agreed to draft a commercial treaty with America as soon as peace was signed with Great Britain. Bureaucratic red tape and the corruption of the Tsar's ministers dragged the matter on till 1803 when finally Leverett Harris was appointed Consul to Russia, and in 1809 John Quincy Adams was sent as first minister plenipotentiary to Russia.

Official tsarist Russia was friendly to the United States despite its enthusiasm for revolution and republicanism. The tsars supported America because they feared England's imperialism more than America's democracy. England was a traditional rival of the tsars' expansionist dreams toward the Mediterranean and the middle East. Historically, Great Britain became the potential enemy of the United States and of Russia. These two latter countries, while greatly differing in their social orders, had no serious economic and political rivalry. Hence Russian-American relations were provided with a healthy lasting basis. When in 1812 England and America were again at war Russia offered to mediate between them and this was gratefully accepted by the United States. Russia's position in the American Civil War was of the same friendly nature. The Russians sided with

the North against England and France, who favored the South. Russia even sent a fleet of warships to American waters to demonstrate against intervention on the part of any of the European powers in favor of the Confederates. At that time public opinion in Russia was ideologically in harmony with the aspirations of Lincoln. The emancipation of the Russian serfs in 1861, while far from solving Russia's agrarian problem, nevertheless was generally accepted by progressive public opinion as a victory for liberty. This friendly attitude of the Russian people in America's great national crisis was highly appreciated by the United States government which at the close of the conflict sent Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox to Saint Petersburg to express America's gratitude to the Russian people.

When the Russian people in turn fought to overthrow their own oppressors and the Soviet Republic was established in October, 1917, the Allied Council in Paris decided on military intervention to crush the proletarian revolution and America was asked to join. It did so very reluctantly and throughout the hostilities never became an enthusiastic participant in this shameful affair. Apparently America feared a victorious Socialism less than the rivaling imperialisms of capitalist countries. There were always certain elements in the American Mission in Russia which favored co-operation with the Soviets. President Wilson himself was at times very complimentary to them. Thus at the occasion of the Brest Litovsk peace parleys he said in addressing Congress on January 8, 1918: "Their (the Russian people's) power is shattered. And yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield; neither in principle nor in action. Their conception of what is right, of what is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind." The same note of sympathy is expressed in President Wilson's cable to the All Russian Congress of Soviets in Moscow on March 11, 1918. In this message he said:

"May I take the advantage of the meeting of the Congress of the Soviets to express the sincere sympathy which the people of the United States feel for the Russian people at this moment when the German power has been thrust in to interrupt and turn back the whole struggle for freedom and substitute the wishes of Germany for the purpose of the people of Russia. Although the government of the United States is unhappily

not now in a position to render the direct and effective aid it would wish to render I beg to assure the people of Russia through the Congress that it will avail itself of every opportunity to secure for Russia once more complete sovereignty and independence in her own affairs, and full restoration in the life of Europe and the modern world.

"The whole heart of the people of the United States is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves forever from autocratic government and become the masters of their own life."

Unfortunately, the forces opposed to the Soviets got the better of the President and the American people were deluded with hostile propaganda which kept the two nations apart for over a decade and a half until President Roosevelt courageously broke the deadlock. But even during the darkest hours of Soviet American relations there were far-sighted statesmen and public-spirited American citizens who read the signs of the time and advocated a rapprochement with the Soviets. One of these was William Bullitt. In the spring of 1919 he returned from the diplomatic mission to Moscow on which the President had sent him. He reported that a peaceful settlement of all the differences with the Soviets was quite possible. His conclusions were: "No government save a socialist government can be set up in Russia to-day except by foreign bayonets, and any government so set up will fall the moment such support is withdrawn. . . . No real peace can be established in Europe nor in the world until peace is made with the revolution on a just and reasonable basis—perhaps a unique opportunity." Who can doubt to-day that William Bullitt saw further and deeper than the diplomats assembled in Paris.

We cannot go into the details of the reasons why President Wilson and the Republican administrations which succeeded him refused to follow Bullitt's advice to make peace with the proletarian revolution.¹ Nor shall we tell the sad story of the consequences of this failure. It precipitated the civil war and the allied intervention which destroyed millions of lives, chiefly of Soviet citizens, and incurred huge material losses to all participants. We may, however, point out some of the reasons why the Washington administration finally came to terms with the Soviets. These reasons were of course chiefly economic, although not exclusively so. Nothing succeeds in America like success. After the enemies of the Soviets had

¹ Those interested in this aspect of Soviet-American relations are referred to our book, *The Communist Answer to the World's Needs*, Chapman and Hall, Ltd., London.

for a thousand times declared the Communist experiment bankrupt, a chimera, unfit to stand the test of time, the Soviets continued to exist and were able to accomplish successfully such huge projects as the Five Year Plan. This impressed the American people most profoundly. Above all, the Soviet government paid its bills, while many capitalist countries defaulted and went bankrupt. Even last year the Soviets paid one billion roubles gold for purchases made on credit. All of its present obligations incurred in connection with the First Five Year Plan are not much over 200 million dollars gold and the finances of the country justify the belief that these will also be paid when the bills become due. Such healthy finance no other country can boast. This the American bankers know and they also know that the Soviet Union is at present the safest and widest market in the world. Before the great depression overcame the United States American business men could afford to ignore the Soviet market, but now they cannot do this any longer without endangering the security of the whole economic system of America.

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS AND WORLD PEACE

The overthrow of tsarism and of the capitalist social order by the proletarian revolution in Russia resulted in a radical change of foreign policy in the new Soviet state. The tsarist rapacious imperialism was abandoned and a new international policy aiming at world solidarity of the toiling population and at equality of the oppressed nations, came into being. It gradually is forging its way to the attention of the world.

Events of recent years must have convinced even the most critical observer that the Soviet Union is consistently and relentlessly pursuing a policy of peace and international good will. It has been demonstrated, for example, by the friendship which has developed between the USSR and Turkey, radically reversing the former imperialist designs of the tsar. By now all of the proximate Western neighbors of the Soviet Union from Finland to Rumania have convinced themselves that they need not fear the Soviet power, and all of these minor states agreed to sign pacts of non-aggression proposed to them by the Soviet Union. At the same time the government of the USSR proposed to insert into the pacts a clear definition of the aggressor, placing the responsibility upon that nation which first invades the territory of another people. Similar international agreements were signed with a number of the bigger powers of Europe but

unfortunately Japan so far has refused to sign a pact of non-aggression and accept the definition of the aggressor. At the Geneva Disarmament Conference the Soviet delegation not only proposed total and general disarmament but wholeheartedly supported proposals of partial disarmament made by other nations, as for example the proposals of the United States delegation for a substantial proportional reduction of all types of armament. All this shows that the Soviet Union has become a bulwark for international peace and the people of the USSR are looking to Uncle Sam hoping to find in him an ally in this struggle for peace and international goodwill. This Soviet policy is neither sentimental nor accidental; it is the logical sequence of the premises underlying the social philosophy of Soviet Communism which happily is reinforced by historic reality and the fortunate situation of the Soviet Union, making capitalist imperialism quite unnecessary and under present conditions quite impossible in the USSR.

"Look at the white man's rifle that shoots so fast and true"—

This line from Kipling, the poet of British imperialism, is not the slogan of Soviet policy in dealing with the minor nationalities and the backward people which the Soviet Union inherited from the days of tsarist despotism. We have a good example in the Central Asia and Caucasian republics which formerly served as bases for supplying colonial labor and raw material to the capitalist enterprises of the Russian metropolis and were developed as markets to dump the surplus manufactured products upon these defenseless people. The Soviet Union on the contrary has helped these minor nationalities not only to political independence but is equipping them with the basic industries which will make them economically and socially an equal to the other people in the Soviet Union.

Modern imperialism, according to Lenin's definition,² is possessed of five characteristics: (1) concentration of production and of capital intensified to monopoly; (2) the merging of bankers' capital with industrial capital and the creation of "financial capital" and "financial oligarchy"; (3) exportation of capital as differing from export of goods; (4) formation of international combines of financiers for the purpose of monopolistic exploitation of the world; (5) since all territories of the world are already partitioned among the different great powers, and since there are no more vacant areas to be peacefully divided, they can now only be conquered,

² In his essay, "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism."

that is, be taken by force in war. Therefore, war is not only inseparably connected with imperialism, but henceforth an actual part of it; in short, modern imperialism is a struggle for new territories, for the control of natural resources and the raw materials of the world, and the struggle for markets to dispose of the surplus of manufactured commodities and surplus capital. Japan's present aggressive policy in the Far East is a classic case in hand of what Lenin meant by modern imperialism. It threatens China's territorial integrity, America's economic interests and has open designs for the conquest of the maritime provinces of the Soviet Union. Here in the Pacific is the present storm center endangering the peace of the world, which can be avoided only by a close and friendly co-operation of the USSR and the USA.

Japan's political and economic situation is driving her toward an adventure which jeopardizes not only the peace of the world but the welfare of the Japanese people. While the Japanese capitalist is exceedingly aggressive and ruthless in his effort to capture the markets in the Orient, the economic situation in Japan is not very secure. About half of Japan's population has been industrialized because of the shortage in arable lands and the exhaustion of the soil. Japan has few of the materials which she needs for her manufactures. She imports 100 per cent of the cotton and wool for her textile mills which form the largest of all her industries. Other important items in her import bill are: lead, 95 per cent; zinc, 80 per cent; liquid fuel and chemical dyes, 75 per cent; steel, 55 per cent; iron, 45 per cent. She is also short of coal and timber. Many foodstuffs are also being imported, thus 95 per cent of her sugar comes from abroad.

The Soviet Union on the contrary is very fortunate to have all the territory it needs for the expansion of her population and she has opened her boundaries to all oppressed nationalities and classes, as for example to the Jews, for whom an autonomous region has been established in the Far East large enough to accommodate all the Jews in the world who may be gravitating toward national independence. The Soviet Union is also quite independent in respect to raw materials, having practically everything necessary for developing an integral industrial civilization and the provision of her population with home grown food. In this respect she stands on a par with the United States. In addition, the USSR is fortunate to have a socialist planned economy which does not depend on the profit system for development. Hence she is not forced to fight for foreign

markets in order to get rid of her surplus and therefore there is no imperialism in the Soviet Union, for, as we have said, according to Lenin this means a struggle for territory, for sources of raw material and for foreign markets, which under present conditions may be gotten only by violence and conquest. Occupied in their peaceful pursuit the Soviet people look to Uncle Sam, eager to grasp his hand of co-operation from across the other side of the Pacific to insure peace to the Far East and to the world.

IS KINSHIP OF SPIRIT POSSIBLE?

Economic and political necessity are powerful and determining factors in the relations of nations, but they are not happy relations unless there is a kinship of spirit, a common purpose in cultural and social pursuits of the peoples co-operating. Can there be such kinship of spirit between America's capitalist individualism and Soviet Communism? Are the existing differences not beyond mitigation?

This is a serious problem which can be solved only by letting the people know the untarnished truth about both countries. Throughout the years of isolation and struggle campaigns of hostile propaganda were waged against the Soviets by the enemies of Communism playing on the prejudices and fears of the people. The truth, however, cannot be hidden for ever. Public opinion has been gradually changing as a result of thousands of books and articles which have been written and published in America about the USSR. Not that all of these were favorable nor truthful to the Soviets. A flood of lies and misstatements was poured over the American public which proverbially is not very critical minded. Nevertheless, the people soon learned that the prophecies of the anti-Bolsheviks were usually false and those who had taken a more sympathetic attitude toward the Soviets were oftener right than their opponents. The publicity about Russia induced an ever larger number of Americans to travel in the Soviet Union. The trail to Moscow from America which at first was very narrow and sought by few Americans, gradually widened, and the number of tourists has been increasing from year to year. The story which these travelers brought home was far from corroborating the alarmist propaganda of the anti-Bolsheviks. Then there were thousands of Americans who took jobs of all sorts under the Soviet government and their story, too, was quite different from the propaganda of the enemies of the Soviets.

An almost insurmountable offense to God-fearing Americans was

and probably still is the anti-religious sentiment predominant in Soviet Russia. This whole phenomenon is of a very complicated nature which may be understood only on the background of Russia's ecclesiastical and cultural history. It is well known that wherever the church became the mainstay of a social order and the weapon of the ruling class to control the minds of the people, such church inevitably collapsed when the social order on which it depended broke down. This has happened in every social revolution known in history. It was the case during the Protestant revolt in the sixteenth century, during the Puritan regime in the seventeenth century in England, when the established Church was roughly handled. In the great French Revolution at the close of the eighteenth century the Roman Catholic Church had to take the consequences of its alliance with the feudal social order. Similar anti-ecclesiastic movements occurred in the nineteenth century in Italy when it forged its unity under Garibaldi and in the South and Central American states. In our own generation we had anti-religious and anti-clerical movements in Portugal (1910), in Spain (1932), but of course the great proletarian revolution of Russia far surpassed by its magnitude and thoroughness everything known in history in combating organized religion. In all of the other revolutions the discredited reactionary religion was usually replaced by another reformed and culturally more appropriate cult meeting the needs of the emerging social order. Thus the rising to power of the industrial civilization on the continent of Europe and in England was preceded by the Protestant Reformation with its emphasis on individual freedom and initiative, qualities imperative for the development of a successful capitalism. Before the development of modern science every new ideology related to social changes was necessarily theological; but since the triumph of rationalism at the close of the eighteenth century revolutionary movements no longer resort to religious ideology to give rational justification to the emerging social order. It is significant therefore that since the great French Revolution the development of new movements of a revolutionary kind were always anti-religious and anti-ecclesiastical in their tenets, whereas reactionary movements resorted to religion, using it as a brake and a prop to uphold the declining social order. The present alliance of fascism with reactionary ecclesiastical organizations may serve as a good illustration.

The emerging Soviet Communism is unique in so far as it integrally embraces all human interests, economic, political, social and cultural. None

of the forms of the existing religions in Russia, nor for that matter anywhere else, suits the contents of the new communist civilization. Therefore Soviet Communism must create new cultural and spiritual forms in which it may fully express itself, and here lies the key to the understanding of the anti-religious movement in Russia. This does not mean that religious worship is prohibited in the USSR. There are millions who still attend church and chapel in city and country; but it does mean that the clergy as a class have been stripped of political power and have been reduced to functioners of the cult, as officially they are called. If organized religion therefore will survive in the USSR it will do so because of some merits of its own which it might produce to meet some vital needs of the people. No longer can the church expect official favors and be used as a weapon for the new ruling power as has been the case in the past.

While organized religion has thus lost its hegemony in the social and cultural life of the Soviet people, they nevertheless are not devoid of spiritual forces which are developing a new type of spiritual culture. A powerful dynamic moves the new generation to heroic deeds of self-sacrifice and service unprecedented in the history of the country. The moral standards generally have much improved and there is a great interest in the nobler aspects of life. Art, science and education are flourishing, and above all there is a mighty international ideal which has gripped Soviet youth, raising it far above national and racial prejudices, which have disappeared. There are of course subjective preferences among foreign nationalities and Americans have generally been popular because of traits which they have in common with modern Russia, such as their relative freedom from traditions, their pioneering spirit and their daring in tackling big problems. To-day the people of the USSR are faced with the great opportunity of conquering a huge continent consisting of its eastern territory from the Urals to the Pacific. It is a task similar to that faced by the Americans when they pushed from their Eastern coast to the Pacific after the Civil War, with this difference, however: that the people of the Soviets are doing it by socialistic methods rather than by the so-called rugged individualism of the nineteenth century. These common pioneering opportunities with their many privations and hard work make Americans feel quite at home in the USSR and they readily make friends with the Soviets.

Foreigners visiting the USSR soon begin to note this so-called "Soviet Americanism," but they do not know the real reason for it. Thus when

Emil Ludwig, in an interview with Stalin insinuated that the Soviets bow before the country of the dollar, Stalin replied: "You exaggerate, we have no particular respect of everything American, but we do respect American efficiency in everything—in industry, in technique, in literature, in life. We never forget that the United States is a capitalist country, but among the Americans there are many healthy people, in the spiritual and physical sense; healthy in their approach to their job and business. With this efficiency and simplicity we have sympathy. Regardless of the fact that America is a highly developed capitalist country, their habits in industry and production contain something democratic which cannot be said about the old European capitalist countries, where the spirit of feudal aristocracy still prevails."

There is no earthly reason why the Soviets and the American people should not become genuine friends and develop these common traits and spiritual kinship which Stalin observed. There is of course the lack of a common language, but this is not an insurmountable obstacle. The Soviet people are not too proud to learn English and Americans resident in Russia are also rapidly acquiring the language of the country. In this Ambassador Bullitt has set a laudable example. While the economic system of the Soviet is different it does not touch the interests of the great mass of the American workers and of the intelligentsia who as a rule have not much property to boast about. Besides, faith in the permanence of the capitalist system has been profoundly shattered in America, also, and forward-looking men are trying to find the way to a better co-operative social order. The Soviet system has so far been the only successful example of a genuinely co-operative commonwealth in the world, and while the USSR does not interfere in the inner affairs of America, the toiling people of the Soviets are anxiously looking at Uncle Sam. What will he do next?

For the Honor of the Church

FREDERICK K. STAMM

THIS is not a tirade against the church, nor is it a criticism of the ministry. It may be out of fashion to say anything nice about the church, and to the reader it may be somewhat of a surprise to find that anyone regards the church these days as anything but an expensive luxury. But I thought it might be a wholesome diversion.

I have seen enough faults and failures in organized religion to make me disgusted at times, and to wish that I had ordered my life along some other line than the ministry. But just about the time I begin to think of myself as being a rather superior person in spirituality, and long to throw overboard everything that smacks of ecclesiasticism, I ask myself, "Now just what would you do and where would you find a better place to exercise what few talents you possess?" I'm sure that if to-morrow I should walk out of the pastorate, in a short time I would be homesick for the atmosphere of the church. I should miss its singing, its quiet hour of worship, its sacraments, its boys and girls and men and women. I should miss holding a baby in my arms and consecrating it to the church in baptism. I should miss the joy of the marriage altar, and the opportunity of walking with people amidst the shadows of sorrow and death.

I might have made more money in some other direction. In fact I have, on occasions, been offered more money; but since the mere matter of a better livelihood has never bulked large in my calculations, we can leave that aside. What I wanted to do was to put myself into a place where I could serve people. Hence I chose the ministry. I could have chosen some other calling where I could have rendered a similar service, but I chose to become a minister.

And now I should like to tell the great army of people inside and outside of the church, how it has gone with me up to now, and how I look upon this profession which frequently has been regarded as a sort of insipid thing, and which does not bulk large in the minds of many people, sometimes even of church members.

For nearly a quarter of a century it has been my privilege to be a minister. I remember how enthusiastically I entered it. Hadn't I been

graduated from a college and a theological seminary? Hadn't I learned a lot about homiletics, and in practical theology hadn't I studied a number of books and listened to some enlightening lectures from the professor? Now as I look back upon it, I didn't know a thing. I wonder sometimes that the little church I first served put up with me. The only thing that saved me at all, I think, was the fact that I had a natural liking for people, and that somewhere in my makeup there was a love for speaking. I started out to do the best I could, and the people accepted it.

And that leads me to say, first of all, that I am sure I have learned more from people in these years than I have ever been able to teach them. I'm obliged to preach, but they unconsciously instruct me in the larger field of life. I've seen the kindness of the human heart, the gallant way in which many people meet the hard problems of life, the inherent honesty which simple-minded people possess, and the generosity underneath many a rough exterior. I've seen human nature revealed at its best as well as at its worst.

My ministry began before the World War, in a day when people were supposed to be good. That was a day, according to declarations from many quarters now, when church going meant something, when people were not rushing about hither and yon, when they were not money mad, and when the young people were not a law unto themselves. But I have found that people are people in any year, and that inherently they are not any different now than then. You can find the old virtues put on display in one age as well as in another. The practicing of virtues does not depend on the times, but on people.

There, for instance, twenty years ago, was old John Montgomery. His was a rough exterior. His life was an open book. People knew him as he was. I went to see him when he lay dying. He said to me, "Everybody knows what I have been, but I guess the Lord knows me better than anyone else, and I'll take my chance with him." I've often thought since, that if I could be as indifferent to criticisms of people and more concerned about what the Lord of the Universe thinks of my life and preaching, I'd be a good deal better preacher.

Then too, during this depression, there was that Deacon of mine. He was out of work for a year and a half. Three children had to be fed and clothed and a roof kept over the family's head. Did he complain? Not a word from him or his wife. He kept his head up, his hands busy

at odd jobs, his heart warm, and his thoughts sweet. One of the most trying experiences in a minister's life is his inability to be of any material help in times of physical distress. And that was the case here. I couldn't land him a position. But he fought through, and I've learned a lot from his example of courage and optimism.

Recently I buried an aged gentleman. He was a church member, but he was not greatly interested in the traditional practices and ordinances of the church. He said to me one time, "You will never see me at the communion service." And I never did. But on the day of the funeral, as we were waiting to go to the cemetery, an old Jew with his two sons approached me with the question, "Can anyone go to the cemetery where Mr. — is to be buried?" I replied, that I supposed the interment was private. The tears began streaming down the old man's cheeks, and I asked, "Did you know Mr. — quite well?" "Oh, yes, I traded with him for many years. He was a good man. He didn't think in terms of money, he wanted to give people a square deal. He was honest." As he shook with grief I said, "Well, if that is the way you feel about it, why don't you go to the cemetery? The family will be pleased." And sure enough, there he was with his two sons to pay respect to a man in business who was "good" and "honest," and who wanted to give people a "square deal."

I think Zwingli, the reformer of four hundred years ago, had it right when he spoke just before his death, of "that future assembly of all the saintly, the heroic, the faithful and virtuous; when Abel and Enoch, Noah and Abraham will mingle with Socrates, Aristides and Antigonius, with Numa and Camillus, the Scipios and the Catos, and when every upright and holy man who has ever lived will be present with his God." Theological beliefs count so little in comparison to right conduct.

People have taught me, too, that not all men are created equal. Just as everybody has a thumb-print all his own, so everybody has a temperament and disposition all his own; and unless the preacher can see people, not in the mass, but as complete originals, he will not make much progress in his work. You can't put all people in the same pigeonhole. The moment we try to place people in groups and treat them as herds, we are in trouble.

I've learned in these years that there is a way of appealing to each individual. Some respond to blame, some to praise, but I've never yet

found a person who did not react unfavorably to sarcasm or indifference. There have been times when I became a bit sarcastic in the pulpit, and every time I resorted to it, I felt I had lost something. I do not mean that it is the business of the preacher to use sugar-coated words and trim the Gospel to nothingness. I have always been in the habit of speaking plainly and in language that both the learned and unlearned could understand. Woe betide the minister who presumes upon the gift of preaching and treats it lightly! But sarcasm and venom do not belong either in the pulpit or out of it.

Sarcasm embitters an otherwise gentle spirit. If a preacher should wound by his sarcasm, either intentionally or inadvertently, he would better run quickly to the person and apologize. A little man will feel it beneath his dignity to apologize, but to be able to apologize when one ought to do so is the mark of a great-hearted man.

I learned this lesson before I had been in the ministry two years. Farmer Howe was an officer in my little church. He wasn't an educated man, but he was a good farmer and a good father. He was hospitable. I married him to his second wife, and more than once my wife and I were guests at his bounteous table. Sitting in his home one day, I took note of the number of papers and farm journals he had. I asked him if he took a church paper. He replied that he hardly had time to read all the other papers and had not recently taken a church paper.

Some six months later I had occasion to install officers in the church. I had forgotten the question I had put to Farmer Howe about the church paper; but in the course of the sermon I said that church officers ought to be acquainted, not only with their own local church, but with the affairs of the church in general, and that one of the means of information was the reading of a church paper.

At the close of the service I came in due time to shake hands with Farmer Howe. He was angry and his eyes flashed fire. He said, "You insulted me this morning. You asked me about the church paper some time ago, and because I was not a subscriber you thought you would take a poke at me in the sermon." I could not stop to talk it out with him at the time, but remarked that I would be up to see him. He replied, "Well, you can come, but I won't talk with you if you do come."

The next day I went to see him. It was in the autumn, and I found him in the orchard picking apples. At first he would not speak, but by and

by he said that if ever he should come back to church it would be only after I had made a public apology to him. I said, "You don't mean that, do you? Wasn't the statement true that one of the means of general church information is the reading of a church paper?" "Yes," he replied, "but you hadn't any business to say it." It was a long wrestle I had with him before I could convince him that there was nothing personal or sarcastic in my remarks. He saw the point and in a few minutes he had unhitched my horse and fed him, and I was sitting with Farmer Howe and his family at the supper table.

I suppose I could have gotten along in the church without Farmer Howe's presence, and it may be that he was a bit narrow and contrary, but he was a soul, and I couldn't leave in his heart a wound that would never heal. There is a little verse in the Bible which says, "Thy gentleness hath made me great," and the years have taught me that there is the same power in gentleness to break up the hardness and narrowness of men's minds as the sun has to release nature from the icy grip of winter. Tolerance, patience, goodwill—these are worth more than violence or indifference. One can never associate the Gospel of Love with unkindness.

I have been taught too, what a kind and courteous letter will do for people in hours of sadness, and how equally sensitive people are in hours of loneliness and death to thoughtfulness or neglect. Recently I wrote a little letter to a woman who had lost her only child. She replied, "I appreciated your letter. I have often wanted to tell you how greatly I grieve, but could not do it without shedding copious tears. In this letter I can pour out my grief and not feel ashamed." We sometimes think it is silly for anyone to be sensitive. But I find that most people are sensitive, at least at certain times, and if the preacher has sense enough to know it, a word of encouragement and hope at the right time may work a complete revolution in the life.

I heard a preacher say once, "You know I get tired of people, especially after I have been at a place for a few years." Maybe that's the reason why we become so critical of the church. We forget that the church is only the lengthened shadow of its people, and the people being possessed with human faults, the church is faulty too. When one goes back and seeks the reason for the perennial influence of Jesus, he discovers that it is because he loved people. It wasn't righteous people, or because they were rich people or poor people, or people who moved in high social

circles, but because they were personalities in their own right, regardless of the accidents of birth, learning, rank, wealth, religious affiliations and professions. It is this passion for people which must constitute the genius and the insight of the minister of the church. Love for people is the open sesame to the heart, and it is this alone which makes the ministry, which otherwise might become the dreariest of drudgeries, a delight and a consecration.

If there is one thing that makes me know that not all my work in the ministry is mere routine—going up the hill and down again—it is the fact that now and then I get a letter from someone whose pathway I had crossed in years past, who tells me what my ministry has meant in that life. Not long ago I got such a letter. It ran like this: "I heard you and saw you about fifteen years ago. It was the first time and I have not heard or seen you since; but aside from the value of the sermon, I felt you were sympathetic and understanding, and that one could go to you in trouble. Now, after all these years, I have a perplexing problem to solve, and I thought you might help me with it." What people remember of one's ministry is not his intellect, but what has been transmitted to the heart.

Up to now too, in the ministry, I have learned that preaching is not the tame and colorless profession it is sometimes supposed to be. It takes grit to be a minister. Always he is wrestling with some terrific evil that threatens the life of the individual or the life of the church itself. I have great admiration for the scientist who battles with the objective foes of men; for the champions of men's bodies against disease, floods, insects, fevers; for the intrepid spirits who fly airplanes in defiance of the law of gravitation, who throw bridges across streams, put tunnels underground, catch voices out of the air, and the like. But the minister's profession is just as gallant, for he is fighting subjective foes; he fights against everything that is wrong in thought, in reason, in motive, in conduct.

Truth and Right—these are the things for which he must contend. Some say that if he contends too vigorously for these things he will lose his job. Men won't support him financially. I have not found it so. True, men have disagreed with me and I have felt the barbed thrusts of church officials, but no case in this modern day has been brought to my attention where any man who had anything to say, and knew how to say it, did not find a place to say it somewhere within the church.

I've never set out to please people, to cater, and to backslap, for the

sake of effect. I've got enough confidence in people to believe that that isn't what people are looking for; and if I have learned anything about human nature in these years, I know that the preacher who does these things will sooner or later find his influence waning among those to whom he seeks to cater, and by honest men in his congregation he will be regarded as a charlatan.

I've said things in the pulpit which I should not have said. I knew it the moment I said them, and sometimes after a sermon the hot tears were ready to scald my cheeks, and my heart bowed in lowly penitence for the ass I made of myself. Preachers, being fallible, are bound to make mistakes, and the wonder of it all is that intelligent people, sitting in the pews, do not rise up in mass against our blunders. But it is not a preacher's business to dissemble. He must speak out. He must take time to brood and think and dream and fashion his prophecies. And if he does that, and is honest and sincere and lays his burning soul out before his people, they will take him to their hearts and cherish him as a revealer of the infinite God to their slow and stumbling hearts.

All this has been my privilege during these years. When I was ready to start out to college I said to my father, who was a physician, "What would you do, study medicine or become a minister?" He replied, "Son, if I were you I would study for the ministry, for when you are preaching you are always dealing with reality." And I have found it so. I've been dealing with reality all this time—reality which is at once human and divine. I haven't been dealing in stocks and bonds, in prices of gold and silver. My older brother said to me long ago, "Fred, if you don't make money before you are fifty, you'll never make any." Well, I'm getting there now, and I don't know whether I'll have anything to keep my good wife and myself when we grow old, or not. But I've got something better. I've got the comradeship of the hopes and fears and aspirations of the people of my church, and of a host of radio listeners who have written me thousands of letters, not one of which contains an ugly criticism. To work with people and for their educational and spiritual culture is perhaps the most fascinating task of all, and even if the material rewards are small, the privilege of doing it is compensation enough.

The longer I preach the more I love human nature. The minister has nothing to do with creating the mind and heart of his parishioner, or the love of God. But he has a lot to do with making people know that they

have a mind to think and a heart to love, and that overarching them and pervading their lives is the eternal love of God. The church which the minister serves is not brick and mortar and stones. It is not creed and ritual and sacrament. It is human hearts. So long as he preaches he develops faith in the human race. The church and the people who compose it may have a long way to go to perfection, but he believes that both will eventually get there.

I could set down here any number of cases against the church. There is much in institutional religion with which I have never been in accord, and am not now. But the case for the church must stand or fall with the case for all institutionalism. None of the social machines—political, educational, economic and industrial—is entirely adequate. All of them forget the liberty which at the first inspired them and the true freedom which they exist to realize. The case against the church as it fails to incarnate the real spirit of Jesus is precisely the case against the state which fails to measure up to the ideal of democracy, the college which falls short of all truth, the industrial system which does not shelter free and happy workmen.

And just because this inadequacy exists in the church, is the reason I and thousands of other ministers stay in the church. Father Tyrrell insisted that he would stay in the Roman church as long as he could. "I upheld," he said, "the duty of each man to stay within and work for his own household as long as he conscientiously can. . . . I will do nothing unnecessarily to procure my own excommunication, and when it happens I will stand on the doorstep and knock and ring and make myself a nuisance in every way." To be a Francis or a Wiclif or a Wesley is an entirely legitimate desire for every minister. Such a venture will necessarily mean some break with the church as now constituted. But ministers never have and never will come to this prophetic freedom through deliberate neglect and criticism of the existing church. Only the minister who knows the church of to-day through and through, can lead the way for the church to-morrow. A better and more glorious church of to-morrow will never be achieved by those who ignore the corporate continuity of Christian experience. If it is to come, it will be the final achievement of sincere and earnest ministers now in the church.

As I look back over a quarter of a century and forward to the time when I must commit my task to younger and better hands, let me never

forget that in spite of the fact that the mortality of the church is a predictable thing, the church nevertheless has in it a germ of life. Even the most violent of critics will assert that the seed which was sown in the hearts of a few unlettered men by the shores of Galilee, is the one thing which has been kept alive down through the centuries.

I want to tend and water the tree that has grown from that seed. It has stood some heavy gales. Storms of human jealousy and pride have shaken it to its roots; tempests of intolerance have torn away some of its branches; blight after blight of apathy has withered its leaves and thinned its fruit. I was born out of the womb of the church, was suckled at her breasts, and dandled on her knees; and as a no-nothing youngster she entrusted me with her gospel. During these years I have seen her lying mangled on the face of the earth, the laughing stock of fools and wise men. I have contributed my share of pitiless criticism. I have seen men with private tastes and a love for individual fame, resort to all sorts of schemes in a vain attempt to restore some gleam of the lost comeliness of the church. God knows how she needs our care to-day, and it is the minister's business to close her gaping wounds, and engage in the blessed task of healing her diseases.

I want to remember too, that the church is a catholic thing. The reason why we were all made with different temperaments and capacities, was in order that we might make each other's lives rich and beautiful and more abounding. The catholic church is a society of all sorts and conditions of people who live to give themselves to each other; a society in which people tolerate each other's prejudices and foibles and idiosyncrasies in the "wide, many-colored love of Christ."

The kind of a church I want to see is a fellowship in which every kind of Christian can worship and feel at home. I want to forget and bury the battles which we have fought under the guise of Christian conviction, but which have brought us nothing but sects and divisions and ecclesiastical hatred. I long to see a church where all lovers of Jesus can worship together, where Saint Francis and Thomas à Kempis, Father Damien and Cardinal Newman would not feel as strangers to Henry Ward Beecher, Harry Emerson Fosdick and John Haynes Holmes; where John Wesley could preach his gospel and his brother Charles sing it. The church I want to labor for is the open church, the unfenced communion table, and all sorts of ministries and graces which reach the poor, the lame, the halt, the

blind; a church that releases the captives, restores the prisoners, and binds up the broken-hearted. I want to be made ashamed during the balance of my ministry to be a minister of a mere sect.

I want a new life to permeate my ministry in the church. I think by now we ought to have all the conceit knocked out of us. We've been relying on ourselves. We've substituted fuss for faith, busyness for holiness, organization and plant and method and programs for the grace of God. We've been denying that Jesus has anything to do with making over the lives of individuals. I don't want the church to let down in its hard labor, in its scientific methods, in its stately architecture; but with only these the preacher will be a mere jack-in-the-box, the members of the church only hay and stubble, and the church itself a sepulcher and repose of dead men. Let me remember that it is God who gives the harvest.

This is how the ministry seems to me up to now. And as I think of the church—not alone the group I serve, but the church Catholic—the only logical alternative to this for me is a lodge in the desert, the self-sufficing power of a consistent solitude. But I don't want that. I want to be an ambassador of God through the channel of the church.

A Look at the World

FREDERICK W. NORWOOD

I HAVE been taking a look at the world. I have been looking, so to speak, at its back premises. I use the term not disparagingly but merely because, being a Briton, and writing to westernized people, I have a feeling that we are somewhat obsessed by the glittering façade of our powerful civilization, and are not sufficiently conscious of the tremendous changes which are taking place in the outer world, which, after all, is larger in area, in population, and has greater potential resources.

My reflections and conclusions are not the mere outcomes of my fifteen months' journeyings. Rather it would be true to say that my travels were the outcomes of the broodings and investigations of at least twenty-five years. I went to see with my eyes whether the things I had been thinking were actually true.

I lived the first half of my life in Australia, a land which is washed by the Pacific Ocean, where the awakening of Asia was naturally interesting to a thoughtful mind.

The Great War swept me away to the scenes of conflict and left me for fifteen years planted in the heart of London, where I have watched eagerly the struggles of Europe to rehabilitate itself after the world-shaking conflict.

Slowly there has hardened in my mind a conviction that Europe welters in an amazing sea of futility because the real facts are not clearly envisaged. She thinks in continental terms while the driving forces are world-wide in their sweep. She grows desperate over internal frontier disputes, and her inheritances of relatively domestic quarrels, as if she were unaware that the reserves out of which she built up her powerful civilization are ebbing away and that indeed the tide is now running against her.

I had the same sense of futility during the Great War itself, and it has deepened during the sixteen post-war years. It seemed as if that tremendous demonstration of force could not have been so ineffective as it was unless in some drastic way it failed to correspond with the actual facts of the situation. It was not that men were more perverse than at

any previous time, but that the war effort was irrelevant. The ideas and the ideals that actuated it were in time with history and must once have had some basis in reality; but what if the time of history had taken a decisive turn, leaving the facts of an earlier day in the realm of fantasy?

Western civilization might have grown myopic, staring so long at its achievements and its mutual rivalries as to have become unaware of the dangers in the world it had itself brought about, which changes now challenge its techniques in the most thoroughgoing fashion.

In short, I felt this so keenly that I could not resist the impulse to go and test it by actual contacts. And lest I should start with a prepossession and unconsciously labor to confirm it, I did my best to release my mind from its grip, that I might be as neutral as possible in my observations.

I determined to follow as nearly as I could the path of development opened up by the great explorers and merchants, followed as they were by missionaries, officials and soldiers, who, from the fifteenth century onward, put the whole of the outer lands upon the European map of the world. From the time of the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the lure of Asia led the men of Europe on to the unveiling of the entire globe. It drew first the Portuguese and then the Dutch and the English and the French around the Cape of Good Hope to India, China and Japan, while Columbus, in the grip of the same desire to reach India, sailed west and brought to light the double continent of America. By the later eighteenth century also, just when exploration had completed its work, the machine age dawned, and Europe rose to an amazing height of culture in its efforts to conquer scarcity, to draw to itself the raw materials and the cheap manufactures of the far-flung lands of the world. Europe built up her structure upon the broad base of Asia, Africa, the Americas and the islands of the sea.

In my view that process has received a decisive check. The pendulum has swung to its full height and now hovers uncertainly, with a tendency to swing back. The moment finds the European nations more concerned with their engendered rivalries than aware of the fundamental changes which have taken place. Such remedies as are contemplated are in the nature of segregated economic nationalisms, each nation to become hermetically sealed against its neighbors, while meanwhile ships grow less in number and emptier of cargoes. Expansion is now the passionate dream of only the outer non-European world. In these regions Europe is digging-in rather than advancing.

Such is the world of to-day as it had shaped itself in my mind. I wanted to go and sense its realities by actual contact. Therefore I have wandered pretty much in the track of the expansive process of the last five hundred years. I also would sail again to the Cape of Good Hope, diverge from the sea route and see the interior of Africa, pass round and about in India, China and Japan, see the newest of westernized lands in Australia and New Zealand, and at last the huge achievements of the same driving force in the United States and Canada.

I found the white man supreme in Southern Africa. His rivalries are within the old European family stocks. Britain and Holland still contend for mastery with the governmental bias in favor of Holland. Germany is now there, subordinate through battle. But the white man's rule has drawn into the melting-pot many different strains of blood. The "Cape Colored Folk" mingle almost every European blood-stream with the original native stock. Commercialism has brought there the Indian, the Chinese, the Malay to complicate the issues. But the primitive Bantu folk form the base of the pyramid, and it is intended that the immovable foundations shall for ever be black.

The whites believe this to be an elemental necessity. They declare the black man's incompetence. They were so sure of it in earlier times that they added the Indian and the Chinese to the complex of Africa. They know to-day that he can do in mine and field more efficient work than they. They have so impoverished him upon the land that he can be no other than their henchman. They have thus admitted that their original estimate was too low. They are not quite sure that he has reached his maximum height but are determined that he shall stay where he is.

The missionaries worry South African Society with their demonstrations that the Bantu can master arts and crafts, but the ruling races do not argue the case; they simply see to it by trade laws that the partly emancipated black shall find no opportunity either to serve them better or compete with them more effectively. They forget that it is they themselves who plague the Bantu with unrest by making him a non-participating member of their glittering civilization. They have little consciousness of the extent to which communistic theories permeate the black community.

But all is quiet on the white man's front, only that his overseas markets are shrinking and his best potential home market has no purchasing power. For the black man there is only a decreasing outlook.

I went to India. One can be entirely at home amidst the white man's culture in India. Indeed, in certain places society is more English than in England. But the Briton who wanders at large feels like a solitary swimmer in a dark and restless sea.

That it is restless there cannot be the slightest doubt. I give it as my deliberate judgment that there is not an Indian anywhere who does not in his heart resent the white man's supremacy, and cherish the dream of an Indian-ruled state. They differ as to time and method. Many have their reasons for delay. The princes have their reasons, so have the Moslems, the Christians, the civil servants, and the depressed classes. But deep down with some, effervescing with others, is the consciousness that a venerable and venerated racial culture is dissolving under the white man's penetrating impingement. To this they will not be reconciled. They will save Indian culture as soon as they can.

It is not a case for blame and counter-blame. Britain has done much for India. She can still do much. But she has awakened her and cannot put her to sleep again. She could make her, were she to act quickly, a self-respecting member of a Commonwealth of Free Nations, as she has done with others. But will she? If not, the momentum of the mass will be too great for her in the end.

I went to China. The extraordinary thing about China has been her sudden governmental collapse. Nothing on earth so completely demonstrates the disruptive quality of western civilization upon an alien order. For Europe does not develop so much as she undermines. The commercial motive is careless of the foundations so long as it extracts the garnered wealth of goods and labor. It westernizes and considers it all to the good. It forgets that a westernized Oriental is by so much the more a thorn in the side of the West, but the roots of the tree are as deep as ever in the soil of the East.

The treaty ports of China, once so self-sufficient and propulsive, are now rather like beleaguered garrisons. The regions beyond slip farther out of control, while the eyes of the defenders look ever and again over their shoulders toward Japan.

I went to Japan. For the average Westerner Japan is the Eastern crisis. He does not worry about India, unless he is English, and the English do not worry enough. He only thinks of China with superior pity, not realizing that a weak country in a competitive world is more

terrible than "an army with banners," for it is a magnet which draws together all the armies.

But Japan is formidable because she is most like ourselves while remaining integrated in her own culture. She simply carries the competitive method farther than we can follow it. She holds in reserve the military technique with a contempt of life and a capacity for loyalty which the higher reaches of our own education have rendered dubious.

We call her a menace, but it would be better if we regarded her as a traffic signal, "Road Closed Pending Reconstruction." If Europe and America were wise, they would compound their cultural quarrels, unless they intend that their commercial and military techniques should pass into other hands, or believe that there is nothing else of value in their Christianized civilization. For Europe cannot meet again on equal terms the expanding economic challenge of the East; while war in Europe would simply be cultural suicide, leaving the Eastern hemisphere to evolve under another kind of dominance.

The truth is that we are at the end of an era, and on the border of another for which we have no technique. We have really succeeded in reaching our objectives, and are in danger of being defeated by our own victories. We have abolished scarcity, save such as we artificially create. Frightened by our own achievements, and irritated by our own maladjustments, we began by practicing "birth control" upon ourselves, and are now imposing it upon nature. We enforce contraception upon wheat, wool, cotton, coffee, tea, rubber, and almost every other natural commodity; and we impose it also upon our machines. The profit motive, which reaps its greatest harvests through *scarcity*, is forever in conflict with the urge for abundance, which is the sole source of cheapness.

In the East there is accustomed scarcity, and a simpler way of living which makes our cheapness seem relative luxury.

Can we discover a technique which welcomes abundance with both hands, and regards cheapness as a social blessing? That is the problem of the West.

To some it would be to return to a more natural way of living and also to the sources which have created our great civilization.

A Christian Manifesto¹

REVIEWED BY FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL

IT has been in order for some time for somebody to do something of the sort which Professor Lewis has done in *A Christian Manifesto*. The book is a vigorous, not to say passionate reaffirmation of the truths which Doctor Lewis thinks essential in Christianity. In more than one prominent theological school in our country to-day some teachers of systematic theology have given up theism altogether; others have watered the idea of God down into an impersonal process and others seem afraid even to use the word God. As long as we have a situation like this it is just as well for men like Doctor Lewis to speak up. Protests like *A Christian Manifesto* help clear the air.

I do not think I have ever seen a stronger or better statement of the fundamental trustworthiness of the scriptural revelation with a franker recognition of the fallibility and error of the human channels through which such a revelation must come. The book is not afraid of the critical, historical, scientific scrutiny of every detail of the scriptures: in fact, it would go farther than most of us would in accepting the results of all such investigations. The implications of many things Doctor Lewis says are not for the intellectually panicky. The timid soul who, having heard that this book is orthodox, expects to find in it re-enforcement of such dogmas as scriptural infallibility, for example, will get the scare of his life. Yet the book is the best statement I have ever seen of the position that a doctrine like that of the divinity, or, if you prefer, of the deity of Christ, can be made credible and faith-compelling by erring and faulty human utterance. Again, the book is irresistible in its insistence that the strength of the church has always lain in its acceptance of this view of Christ as divine.

Through incessant practice Doctor Lewis has wrought out a fine style for religious utterance. There is a swing about it which carries us along. Speaking for myself, however, I find the style of this book interfered with by the author's constant reference to his consciousness that what he is saying is not in line with current, popular theological discussion. He feels that the modernists will criticize him—that he has said things hard to be

¹ *A Christian Manifesto*. By Edwin Lewis. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

accepted by liberals—that he will appear as inconsistent with previous utterances of his own. All of which gets annoying after a time. Professor Lewis has made his own way—and won an assured position as a thinker in his own right. Even if the modernists, so-called, do not accept it, the book has to be reckoned with.

With my full agreement with the need of a book like this, and with hearty thanks for the greatness of the service rendered in the main points of the treatment, may I call attention to some suggestions which seem to me important. To begin with there is over-exact statement of some truths—or shadowing-forths of truths which are better hinted at than definitely stated. For example, Doctor Lewis takes direct issue with the claim that children are by birth citizens of the kingdom of God, and need chiefly Christian nurture. Children, it seems, are born under the divine wrath and have to be saved by a virtually miraculous operation of grace. All I wish to say about this particular item of theology is that to one who knows Doctor Lewis it is not nearly as terrifying as it sounds. Let no one think that our author is on the path back to the belief that hell is paved with infants' skulls. What we have here is a sturdy belief in the righteousness of God—with perhaps not quite so thorough-going a belief in the divine grace. Now when a writer says that God creates human souls in wrath, we get that stiff idea in our heads. When we have to wait till the next chapter or even till the next sentence to hear about a grace that will go to the last limit to save men from wrath, we have two qualities—or attributes—or forces—or somethings—set over against each other in the divine nature. The Christian truth is that God is a person. He is righteous and he is loving—terms which taken as descriptions give us no particular trouble, for we see human beings who are at the same time measurably righteous and loving. Now let me talk sharply of wrath and then of love, and the abstractions take the field—with the Divine Person the stage where the abstractions do whatever the logical, dogmatic, over-confident intellect calls for. Doctor Lewis says in this book that he wants more iron in theology. Quite right, if we are to use the iron as a tonic. We do not, however, need any more cast-iron, after the fashion of a rigid frame in which divine qualities are to be set.

Again, *A Christian Manifesto* seems to me to over-emphasize the divine sovereignty. The God of Lewis is a fairly gritty Being. Upon occasion, we are told, he can do quite a bit of smashing. Here again it was time that somebody said this—or something like it. Doctor Lewis does

not have overmuch to say about the Fatherhood of God. I am not sure that I wonder at this, for I recognize the force of somebody's jibe that in our soft day the preaching of the divine fatherhood has become the preaching of the divine grandfatherhood—with all the suggestiveness of a grandfather's doddering inability to mark sharp distinctions between right and wrong—and to treat right and wrong differently. Still, if we are going to use terms like sovereignty, we may well consider more carefully the obligations of sovereignty. Doctor Lewis says repeatedly that God has a right to create—I suppose a right to create in wrath but I let this “suppose” pass as a quibble, if the reader chooses. Now has God a right to create? If I may speak as confidently about cosmic and divine ethics as this book does, I say he has no right whatever to create, *unless he is willing to undertake and discharge the obligations thereby assumed*. Obligations to whom? Obligations to those whom he has created. That ought to be enough. There are other obligations, I should think—obligations to the creator's own self-respect, and to the moral approval of any intelligences anywhere. Professor Lewis uses in quotation marks an expression that I have been fond of using—though I do not flatter myself that he knew that the expression is a favorite of mine—the frontiersman's protest against the Calvinistic statement of divine sovereignty to the effect that “the people won't stand it.” The Lewis comment is that the people will have to stand it. We are likewise informed that Christianity does not declare to men the alternative of yielding or not but says “Yield.”

Surely this is the real thing in dogmatism. Nevertheless, situations like this cannot be solved by emphasis. The historic fact is that the people have not stood for some statements of divine sovereignty. If we left out of the history of the church recognition of those who would not yield to statements of arbitrary divine sovereignty no stronger than those of this book, we should have some notable omissions—especially when we count in those who would not bow down to the abominable, privileged and established orders which always flourish in the shelter of these stern statements of divine sovereignty. Professor Lewis's predecessor, Dr. Olin A. Curtis, used to like to quote from Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn*. Perhaps with such a Drew precedent before me, I may be permitted to refer to the same classic. At one crisis in the book, Huck Finn is in terrible inner torment because he is helping “Nigger Jim” to escape from slavery. He feels that he will go to hell if he keeps on in such a nefarious course. At last Huck rises to the heroic with the avowal: “All right, then. I'll go to hell.”

Whereupon his soul was filled with peace. In other like crises, others of mightier historic significance than Huck have found peace in the same way.

Again, *A Christian Manifesto* rather makes light of the statement that we human beings are in this world not of our own choice. Well—the statement happens to state a fact. It is the attitude toward such statements which makes me wonder whether Professor Lewis knows what is back of the widespread distrust of such doctrines of divine sovereignty as his to-day. The truth is that the thinking of hosts upon hosts of honest and earnest people who have lost their hold on Christianity—or on whom Christianity has lost its hold—starts just there, that we are here not of our own choice. They will not share in Doctor Lewis's preference to be damned for the glory of the most old-fashioned Calvinistic notion of God rather than for the glory of whatever bit of material is man's ancestor, in the materialistic basis. They will not accept the Calvinistic God in any case. They may look on themselves as the outcomes of the play of blind forces but they do not necessarily hate those forces. They accept things as they are, things in a desperateness of condition which Doctor Lewis has himself most eloquently stated elsewhere. Men have been on the earth a long time and the majority of them have not up to date found the conditions of proper human existence. The logic of the denial of God would seem to call for frank materialism in conduct—which is what we do not find in persons of the type I have in mind; persons who labor with an undying zeal for the help of their fellows; persons who do not ask how the good and true and beautiful got before us in this strange existence but who accept these as impressive values now that they are here. Moreover, the devotion of some of these mistaken persons to human welfare is so great that in opposition to war, for illustration, they do go to prison and are willing to go to death. They cannot accept an arbitrary sovereign without hating him. They can accept a primordial atom ancestor without hate. It is all illogical, but we have the warrant of this book itself for the idea that in the deeper spiritual crises logic is not the final arbiter. Of course, sovereignty conceived of as the relation of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to his children is another matter. In that sovereignty, Doctor Lewis himself believes and works. What he says about smashing, and having to stand it, and divine condemnation, and all similar matters has to be qualified by the whole trend of his system, in which we can find plenty of grace and mercy. The trouble is that Doctor Lewis is so much more eloquent when he is talking about smashing than when he is talking about grace, that we

remember the smashing longer. In one place or another the reader can find passages which will answer every criticism that can be urged against *A Christian Manifesto*. In a long burst of almost furious eloquence, we have an invective against the church for its apostasy in this, that, and the other. Then a little later we discover that the author is in favor of all these things—except possibly legislative prohibition and legislative socialism. Of course, there is no sense in being too exacting when an author becomes eloquent. In spite, however, of the passionate burst against apostasy by the church, one can hardly keep one's face straight to hear the prohibitionist classified with the apostates. All the section inveighing against the recent large-program activities of Methodism is oratory—good oratory—but oratory just the same. Methodists all can make the proper discount. One form of our apostasy was the attempt to get so much money for grandiose schemes, which was admittedly a mistake. Inasmuch, however, as it was all conceived in good faith, and carried on as far as possible in good faith, and represented the honest self-sacrifices of millions of people, the word "apostasy" seems to be merely one of those terms which a man grabs at when he is making a speech. If I may say so without being intentionally unfair, a good deal of our most famous and most successful campaigning—our Centenary—aimed at aiding our theological schools. If that is apostasy, let us make the most of it.

Well, so much for "sovereignty and apostasy!" All that to one side, there are superb passages in *A Christian Manifesto*. Whether we agree with all the author's conclusions or not at disputed points, we may be confident that we shall never find them better stated. Nobody that I know of has ever phrased better the significance of the Atonement for God Himself. Moreover, whatever we think about the Trinity, I believe we shall have to admit that the following putting is about perfect of its kind—in profundity, in comprehensiveness, in perspective: "In essence, the Trinity means that the Eternal God is the subject of a necessary process of self-differentiation, which he can no more prevent than he can prevent his own existence, and which results in his containing within himself all the elements of a complete personal experience."

Book Reviews

The Life of Our Lord. By CHARLES DICKENS. New York: Simon and Schuster. \$1.75.

It is a pity that some American reviewers could not have taken this "Life of our Lord" for just what it is, a simple, reverent, beautiful story written for Dickens' own children who were all under twelve years of age. Of course it is uncritical and is keyed to the understanding of those for whom it was intended.

The author would not consent to its publication and regarded it as a purely personal message to his own family. Perhaps his wish in this matter should have been honored, as it was for eighty-five years. Yet we cannot feel that any serious error was committed in making it available to the public.

Those who expect to find in it any new contribution of thought to our interpretation of the New Testament, or any unusual literary quality, will be disappointed. It is a simple recital chiefly in the language of Saint Luke's Gospel. Here and there quaint and beautiful touches suggest the genius of the author, but there is no effort to secure literary effects. "An angel all light and beautiful comes moving over the grass toward them." So he delicately suggests the nativity story of the shepherds and the angels. Naturally the interest of Jesus in childhood is stressed: "Our Saviour loved all children. Yes and all the world. No one ever loved all people, so well and so truly as he did."

A fine human spirit breathes through the story. It has long been recognized by students of Dickens that he was the most important force in English litera-

ture in calling attention to social evils of the time. In this brief and simple story the source of Dickens' sympathy for the oppressed and unfortunate is laid bare. The pity and love of Jesus Christ expressed in comfort, healing and forgiveness have opened the fountains of his own social passion.

Dickens' own youth must have contributed to his knowledge of the hard lot of the unfortunate in England in the first half of the nineteenth century. He once said, "I know that but for the mercy of God I might easily have been, for any care that was taken of me, a little robber or a little vagabond."

Perhaps such a memory had something to do with his desire to guide his own children into more humane and Christian attitudes through this "Life of Our Lord."

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE.

Editor of Church School Publications of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Russia Challenges Religion. By GEORGE MECKLENBURG. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.00.

RUSSIA challenges the Church to do something more than preach. And we listen to Doctor Mecklenburg because he has done that in, and through, his church in his own city—not because he has been to Russia.

Our crying need is a better social order and Russia can teach us many things—but not everything. This is in a sentence, the thesis of this book. Communism is dying out in Russia, he says, and is already dead in most other countries.

Citing a number of places where re-

ligion may well learn from the Communists he eventually carries the war into the enemies' country and "Christianity challenges Communism" rather than the opposite.

It is a "glorious experiment," Over There, but will, likely, be frustrated by its materialism and anti-religion.

"When the church fails to fight the battles of the people then God is not in the church." "What is more pathetic . . . than a godless church?"

The author has traveled in Russia, talked with people in Russia, and gathered many interesting stories. He is fair in his judgments. He has a rapid, moving style and has put a lot of informative material between the covers of his very readable book.

JESSE HALSEY.

The Seventh Presbyterian
Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Letters From Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece. Edited with an Introduction by GWENDOLEN GREENE. London: J. M. Dent, 1932 (reprinted). \$2.00.

THOSE who have followed the steadily increasing vogue of Baron von Hügel's thought in this country recently will be grateful for this collection by his niece of his letters to her, covering the last six years of his life. There could be no finer way to the understanding of the great Catholic modernist than through these informal, chatty, utterly delightful letters, which reveal far better than much of his more systematic writing his profound understanding and practice of Christianity. The editor has arranged them chronologically, omitting none of the passages of distinctly theological interest and yet including enough of the more intimate touches to give the book the authentic flavor of the great personality it mirrors. An extended intro-

duction, with excerpts from what is to follow, lends a warmly personal sympathy to the book which wins the reader at once. Yet the central feature of the book is its reflection of von Hügel, and this has been the sole aim of the editor. Such phrases as these stand out clear-cut: "We need not try to conceive God: he attends to all that," "Religion has never made me happy. . . . All deepened life is deepened suffering, deepened dreariness, deepened joy. . . . The final note of religion is joy."

The editor has simply wished to let the writer of the letters show through every page. This she has accomplished admirably by her selection of the letters, which afford a complete glimpse of his many-sided, comprehensive personality, and by an apparent absence of the intruding editorial element which might easily have proved destructive if handled by a less skillful person. As it stands the book is a memorial in his own words to a modern Christian thinker for whom belief and experience were inextricable, and to believe was to act in the light of that belief. The fineness and the catholicity of his spirit, as well as his deepening sensitiveness to religious values, make his writing significant for both those with a professional interest in religion and those who are definitely searching for light and meaningfulness in life, but are not religiously affiliated or concerned.

ROGER HAZELTON.

Chicago Theological Seminary.

How Can I Find God? By LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. \$1.50.

THE title incites the expectancy of a volume of reasoned apologetics. So far from that the author declares that any church is wrong which demands allegiance to a creed as a condition of mem-

bership. His book is a pleasant setting forth of common-sense vitalities. It can be read in a couple of hours. It cannot be read reflectively without refreshment.

Like Gaul, this book is divided into three parts. The first considers whether we may be hiding from God by refusing to repent of some evil behavior or by continuing content with lesser goods. Part two discusses how God can be found and part three how a believer may know that God has been found.

Finding God to the author is no agonizing search to discover or even understand. To find God is to get "I" out of the way so that God can find me. If God did not give himself we could not come to him. If he gives himself we have only to take him.

Nature, art, music, literature, law and order, truth and goodness, love and friendship, whenever they are met by a complete human response, provide an experience of God. Such an experience is probably as real an experience of God as that of a person emotionally moved by hysterically singing hymns at a revival meeting. All these experiences are less than what the New Testament calls the experience of God in Christ.

The author places his dependence upon an act of imaginative faith which thinks of God as present. It is questionable whether that is as sure an approach to God as that of practicing the mind of Christ recommended by the author of *I Follow the Road*. His approach, however, affords the author such certainty that he writes: "If it is scientific to use the faculty of sight to make sure of the presence of a visible person, why is it unscientific to use the faculty of imagination to realize an unseen presence?"

To Mr. Weatherhead, in his extraordinarily successful ministry, "Finding God" means entering into a personal, conscious communion, spirit with spirit,

with one recognized to be a fitting object of worship and love, in whom we find forgiveness of sins, whose will we desire to do, and in whom all our highest values are conserved.

JOHN W. LANGDALE.

Book Editor of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Prayers for Services. A Manual for Leaders of Worship. By MORGAN PHELPS NOYES. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50.

MATTHEW ARNOLD was voicing the experience of the race when he said that, while man philosophizes best alone, he worships best in common. The supreme function of the church is to communicate to human lives a sense of the presence of the living God. Worship is the primary office of the church. Worship is something real; it is the actual union of man with God. It is a known and felt participation of a man with the redemptive purpose of God.

Much is being said and done today about the necessity for improving the means of inducing the spirit of worship in our churches. Here is a manual for leaders of worship that fills a real need for a book that will guide in the difficult field of the conduct of worship. The practice of prayer should bring to the worshipers an awareness of the living God. Doctor Noyes is very sensitive to the real meaning of worship. It must get us God.

Public worship is not a season of enjoyable spiritual entertainment. Public worship is the lifting of our lives, together, into unison with God, into unison with one another in the mighty human drama that actually brings the divine on to the stage of life. Public worship signifies that we give ourselves to God and to each other. It is the essential outward sign of an inner fellowship.

Here is a book that should prove helpful and enriching to the ministers of our churches. Invocation, Confession, Thanksgiving, Petition, and Intercession mark the gamut of prayers for use in all types of services of worship. There is recognition of the Christian Year and those Special Days and Seasons that have come into usage. Ancient and modern, the liturgical tradition and the free expression are here. This should prove a valuable book to add to every thoughtful minister's library.

OSCAR THOMAS OLSON.

The Wilmette Parish Methodist
Episcopal Church, Wilmette, Illinois.

Studies in the Lectionary Text. Vol.

I. By COLWELL and RIDDLE. University of Chicago Press. \$2.00.

Two fifths of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, numbering 1,600 items according to Doctor Gregory's lists, consist of lectionaries, that is, manuscripts designed for use in church services. They represent the pulpit Bible of the Eastern Church in the Middle Ages and contain lections for the ecclesiastical year from Easter to Easter, and for the calendar year from September 1 through August. From Easter to Pentecost of the ecclesiastical year, the lections were taken from John's Gospel, from Pentecost to September 1, from Matthew's Gospel, from September 14 to the beginning of Lent, from Luke's Gospel. For the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent, Mark's Gospel supplied the lections. For Holy Week there are selections from all four Gospels. In several lectionaries, there are eleven morning resurrection lections taken from all four Gospels.

Several reasons are given by the editors for the long neglect by textual scholars of the testimony of these lectionaries. Some ignore them simply because they are minuscules and so not

worthy of their attention; others, because they are the product of the Eastern Church, treat them as exotic and hard to understand; while not a few, after a cursory examination, regard their text as conforming to the Received Text and that their testimony therefore is negligible. The editors in this volume show very clearly that the text of these lectionaries is very heterogeneous, varying considerably in quality, and contains a high percentage of neutral variants and many striking western readings. "Figuratively speaking," Doctor Riddle says, "the lectionary is a preservative into which from time to time portions of the living text are dropped."

This first volume represents an excellent beginning to remedy the long neglect of this important source of information for the history of the text of the New Testament in the Middle Ages. Students of the New Testament will greatly appreciate the general studies and the special discussion of the lectionaries of Mark in Part I, and the careful collations of the four lectionaries, the Argos, Gruber, Scheide and University of Chicago manuscript 715 in Part II.

J. NEWTON DAVIES.

Drew University,
Madison, New Jersey.

The Air Menace and the Answer. By

ELVIRA K. FRADKIN, with an Introduction by James T. Shotwell.
New York: The Macmillan Company. \$3.00.

This book rightly takes its place beside such recent studies of the armament problem as *Merchants of Death* and *Iron, Blood and Profits*, in affording a well documented source-book of factual material. It covers a different and more important phase of the war and peace problem. There have been new developments in death-dealing appliances which are

overlooked in most of the literature of both militarists and pacifists. This book does not make that prevalent mistake. A reader of *Iron, Blood and Profits*, by Seldes, for instance, might reasonably conclude that world peace would be assured by government ownership and control of armament and munitions works.

The author uses admirable restraint in depicting the facts in relation to the turn a future war must inevitably take. These facts should be known by all who would face the war situation realistically. I do not know of any other one volume which meets the issues without sensational embellishments.

The material is assembled in four parts in a way that is both readable and easily accessible for reference. The first relates to chemical warfare and deals especially with its effects on non-combatants in a future war. Chemical disarmament is shown to be an impossibility under modern conditions, when any laboratory or chemical industry may be quickly converted into a source of an unlimited supply of poison gas. The second section deals with aviation and shows how easily civilian planes can be converted into bombers. An interesting and practical proposal is that of the internationalization of civilian aviation. The third section of the book deals with the effects of aerial chemical warfare and the last part gives the answer to the air menace in a renewed sense of the urgency of dealing with the roots of the war problem. Many peace advocates are just playing around the edges of the issue. When one faces the facts as portrayed in this excellent volume a new impetus is given to the effort for a warless world.

Only in rare instances does the author fail to give adequate documentary proof. For instance, in questioning the efficacy of the present out-moded forms of armaments the author states that "the large

battleship is so unwieldy and inefficient that even Admiral Sims of the American Navy advises sending American battleships as far up the Mississippi as possible for safety in the event of war against the United States." (page 220). Many readers would like to know just when and where this statement was made.

LOYD F. WORLEY.

Norwalk Methodist Episcopal Church,
Norwalk, Conn.

Reflections on the End of an Era.

By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. New
York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
\$2.00.

THE era whose end moves Professor Niebuhr to reflect is of course the era of capitalism, which he confidently affirms has run its course. The capitalistic order, he says, is dying not because of any violence done it from without, but because of fatal defects inherent in its own constitution. The irony attending its death is that just when all its friends and supporters—especially those optimistic liberals who were guiding its moral education—were most hopeful regarding its future, it was already nearing its end. They had been deceived into mistaking pathological symptoms for signs of health and strength. For example, the vast and complex machine civilization which it had created had been looked upon as a mark of real progress when in reality it was only the means by which men in control of it organized the natural will-to-live into the deadly will-to-power. What was referred to proudly as the triumph of the scientific spirit was simply the futile effort to control nature by reason, an effort which has always failed. While the faith which liberal Christianity had in the slow but inevitable unfolding of moral evolution was merely the rationalizing

of certain humanitarian impulses and checks. Yet under capitalism there were gains worth conserving.

But what era is to follow? Probably an era in which some sort of state socialism will be tried. Still, Professor Niebuhr is not optimistic about its success. Indeed, he is far from any such optimism. He asserts the truth that neither socialism, nor communism, nor Fascism nor any other form of social arrangement will usher in the kingdom of God. In fact it is this rather skeptical point of view that leads the author to indulge in those interesting reflections which make up the major portion of his book. These reflections assume a somewhat Pauline cast as Professor Niebuhr proceeds to uncover and analyze the deep conflict between "nature" and "spirit" which is going on, always has gone on, and always will go on in man as an individual and in man's theater of social action in history. And he comes to the conclusion that this conflict will never be brought to a successful issue with "spirit" on top, no matter what order man lives under. His discussion of this conflict in the light of the character and teachings of Jesus, in the light of the endeavor of the Christians in the Early and Middle Ages to resolve it, and in the light of what is happening in the world to-day is illuminating and persuasive. The reflections end with a chapter on "The Assurance of Grace," in which the author, leaning toward classical Christianity, declares that only in a Gospel of Divine Grace is the conflict ever resolved.

The book is well written and easily read; it stays on the level of the practical; and it is a much-needed tonic for disillusioned liberals. There are many questions one would like to ask Doctor Niebuhr, but space prevents them being

asked here. At any rate, a book which raises questions is worth reading.

HERBERT H. FIELD.

Flatbush Presbyterian Church,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Meaning and Message of the Fourth Gospel. By C. J. WRIGHT.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$2.00.

THIS volume, as the sub-title says, is "A Study of the Application of Johannean Christianity to the Present Theological Situation." Doctor Wright is tutor in systematic theology and philosophy of religion in Didsbury College, Manchester, and is another of the growing school of English writers who are laying the religious readers of the English-speaking world under obligation for their sound scholarship and solid piety.

This volume is a new approach to Saint John's Gospel. It is not a critical but an interpretative study of this much-discussed record of the earthly life of Jesus. No time is wasted in the elusive search for the real author of the gospel. Doctor Wright conjectures it was written by the Elder John of Ephesus and leaves it there. Perhaps that guess is as good as any.

But whoever the anonymous writer was he possessed a deep spiritual intuition which gave him insight into the filial consciousness of the divine Son. The author maintains that the church moved away from its historic foundations when she made a metaphysic determinative of the real Christ. Ever since that time the real Jesus has been hidden behind a veil of speculative dogma. And not only has the Person been obscured but the idea has become regnant that in order to become a Christian one must first give intellectual assent to doctrinal statements and not at once embark upon a life of faith and obedience. He concludes with others

that the admixture of Greek speculation with Christian experience was not an unmixed blessing to the church.

The church of to-day, he says, is called to the theological implications of this the most spiritual of all the Gospels. The present distress in theology has risen largely because of the idea of the absoluteness and finality of such creedal statements as are taught by the church. Our future Christologies must be founded on the historic Christ and must never obscure him. They must be based on experiential and not on metaphysical values. John is a mystic and all the mystics of the centuries have been at home with him. Personal direct vision of God is the nerve of all true religion and a theology which has no room for the intuitive knowledge of God will never be other than a truncation.

Doctor Wright bases his credo upon a perfect human being who possessed a unique consciousness of the presence of God and in this manner brought eternity into our midst. Man being in the image of God is capable of sensing his divine author. This religious sensibility makes way for the divine immanence which in itself indicates some eternal values in man. The doctrine of divine grace taught in the gospel manifests necessarily a lofty doctrine of man. Here is no "worm" theology. "We do not show a high estimate of the value of divine grace by regarding it as offered to one who is less than worthy of it. Such gifts are not bestowed upon the inert and dully acquiescent."

The Johannine message culminates fitly in the doctrine of eternal life—qualitative, and a life of timeless reality. This is not an ecclesiastical dogma but a rich spiritual experience. Such an experience may be philosophically debatable, but he who has it knows it and there's an end of it.

The book is richly experiential in value. Doctor Wright writes out of a full knowledge of all that has been written of any value on this subject and under an inner compulsion to state what he feels to be the real meaning and message of the author of the gospel to this day and generation. The Gnostics may take issue with him, but to those who apprehend that religion is an experience and not a metaphysical subtlety, the book will prove to be most profitable and enjoyable from cover to cover. It is intellectually stimulating and spiritually uplifting.

GLADSTONE HOLM.

Fletcher Methodist Episcopal Church,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Methods in Sociology. A Critical Study. By CHARLES A. ELLWOOD.
Durham, North Carolina: Duke
University Press. \$1.50.

VERY challenging and stimulating is this newest product of the facile pen of Professor Ellwood. A book written upon the basis of objective facts, personal experience, and the value judgments of the competent has always supreme value. Dealing as this book does with a subject of supreme importance to students of sociology, and of equal moment to students of religion and ethics, one is convinced of its value as a guide through the mazes of controversy concerning method in the field of science out into the clearer road to social achievement and progress by an enlightened methodology in the cultural sciences.

Professor Jensen says in his Introduction, in agreement with the author, "Since the sciences of culture differ from the natural sciences in their subject matter and problems, they require a different methodology for their development" (p. xvii). Professor Ellwood is not opposed to the scientific method in

Sociology, but he objects strenuously to the assumptions of dogmatic Objectivism among sociologists and to the inadequacy of Behaviorism to explain the phenomena of human behavior in the associated state. He says, "The behaviorist calmly ignores the creativeness of the human mind and attempts to describe human society in the same terms in which he would describe a colony of rats" (p. 65). And the reason of the inadequacy of "Objectivism" in Sociology is "that the social sciences are much more sciences of culture than of nature" (p. 64).

Throughout the entire volume the author shows with great clarity of argument and much convincing force "that the scientific methods found useful in the natural sciences cannot be adapted with any high degree of success to the social sciences and that the social sciences must therefore develop distinct methods of their own" (p. 67).

It is at this strategic point for Religion and Ethics that our search for reality in the social sciences is directed away from the measurable objects of the material universe, to the areas of human impulses, aspirations, hopes and eternal values that have made civilizations and enduring cultures possible, and toward the perfection of which after the pattern of the kingdom of God those who have caught the vision continually strive to make real in their generation.

In addition to this aid in methodology for Religion, Ethics, and Social Work, the author has also shown in a series of chapters the contribution Sociology has made to these important fields of Social Science in keeping our methods of Education, Legislation, and Government in step with Social Progress. This progress is made possible by the ethical and spiritual insights which come to those who lead us to heights of achievement

beyond the frontiers of our social heritage.

EDWIN L. EARP.

Drew University.

Schleiermacher and Religious Education. By ANDREW R. OSBORN. London: Oxford University Press. \$2.50.

ACCORDING to historical criteria the importance of any character or episode is to be rated by the social changes that come from its influence. Measured by this test Schleiermacher as pictured by Doctor Osborn in this book does not make good on Osborn's claim that he was as great a religious educator as he was a theologian.

It will be remembered that Schleiermacher's working life corresponded almost exactly with the first half-century of the Sunday school. Yet it does not appear that he had during that time any influence on this vital movement which was taking place in England and America, from whose stimulus later it spread to the continent. And, according to Doctor Osborn, "his writings on religious education are practically unknown" even to-day.

Since the present year is the centenary of Schleiermacher's death one will not expect his discussions on education to be couched in modern terminology. The germs of living ideas did exist, nevertheless, in many of his teachings, as the biographer has so well brought out. For example, he put the home and the family at the foundation of all education. He demanded a clear and coherent philosophy to set the goals for instruction in religion. He anticipated the modern educator by insisting that the development of personality is the great positive task of education. He stood with the progressive educator in planning education to develop the native powers and interests inherent

in the child. He also sided with the disciplinarian in advocating reasonable restraint to check perverse tendencies in the young. The church, in view of the failure of the family to perform its full duty toward training the child in religion, must make education one of its primary obligations.

Surely this is a very respectable set of planks for the educational platform of any church, and it is well to have them given the authority of so great a man. One could wish that the author of the present volume had written more as an educator and less as a theologian and philosopher, so that he might have related Schleiermacher's views more definitely to the problems of present-day religious education. For throughout the book there is almost no carrying over of the great leader's positions, showing how they throw light on to-day's needs. One wonders whether the biographer's own position on the scientific approach to religious education is reflected in his assertion that Schleiermacher's religious fervor "was inherited both from his father and his mother." We no longer speak in educational circles of religious attitude as heritable.

The topics which are dealt with in the book are fairly represented by the following interesting chapter titles: The ethical basis of education; What is religious education; The development of personality; The Christian mind; Education as restraint and discipline; Religious education in home and school; The church and religious education; The problem of evil.

Doctor Osborn is to be commended for the patient thoroughness with which he has applied trained scholarship to his task. Possibly this thoroughness was to be expected, as the writer explains that the book in its original form was written as a doctorate dissertation. Neverthe-

less, the sound learning that shows in its pages is satisfying to the serious reader.

If the reviewer were to be allowed a suggestion as to method, he would advise a larger use of quotation from Schleiermacher himself. Of course this would have to be in translation, but even so, the noted thinker would seem to deserve a chance to express a thought now and then in his own words.

The present writer fears that Doctor Osborn's hope to make the positions of the great Schleiermacher serve as the foundations for modern religious education will not be realized. For all he places before us from Schleiermacher is already familiar in recent educational theory, much of it in educational practice, and probably none of our current theory or practice can be traced back to Schleiermacher as its source.

GEORGE H. BETTS.

Northwestern University.

The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology. By R. NEWTON FLEW.
New York: Oxford University Press. \$3.75.

A BOOK like this was long overdue. It is true that we had, not so long since, Dr. Kenneth E. Kirk's Bampton Lecture on *The Vision of God*, but the emphasis there was largely on the mystical. What we needed was a treatment of the idea of perfection in its meaning for ordinary everyday life. Doctor Flew, a Cambridge tutor, has at last met the need, and he has done it in such ample fashion, and with such complete respect to the whole history of Christian thought on the subject, that the book is likely to remain the standard treatment for many years to come.

Doctor Flew's claim is that perfection is an intrinsic element of original Christianity, that the idea has often enough been abused by being narrowed as to its

range or by being presented as applicable only to the few or by being identified with a merely ecstatic state or by being divorced from life's practical and ethical demands, but that through all this misunderstanding and misapplication the idea itself has persisted in the church, finding expression again and again in perfectly normal ways.

But in what sense is perfection to be taken? Not in the sense of mere sinlessness, which is simply a negative idea, and in any event impossible of attainment if sought as an end in itself and if isolated from the larger area of Christian truth. Perfection is the ideal of the Christian life conceived as an increasing participation in all that Jesus meant as the kingdom of God. The analysis of Jesus' teaching as to the Kingdom is one of the good things in the book. Properly enough, Doctor Flew begins with it. He faces frankly the presence of the apocalyptic element, but he avoids the various extremes of interpretation. The paradoxical features of the apocalypticism he explains, in the words of Baron von Hügel, as due to the necessity of conjoining in one view "the simultaneity of God and the successiveness of man." The life of the Kingdom is a life "from above" in the sense that it is the permanent unchangeable quality of the Divine. It is eternal. It comes into time as the pure gift of God. In a quite unique sense, Jesus is its bearer, as he is also its supreme exponent. As experience, it is both individual and social, taking the form, in the present age, of "forgiveness, communion with God, a life of love among men, a life lived on the level of miracle." Because the experience is wrapped up with the historical process, it is subject to all manner of variation. But *the thing itself* is already "here" just as it is "there." It is "there" in its perfection—the life of eternity. It is

"here" as a continual appropriation through faith and surrender, through love and service. The "here" is forever approaching the "there," but their complete junction waits on a life to come.

With this scarlet thread in his hand, Doctor Flew makes his way through the maze of Christian thinking on the high theme of perfection. It is a long and involved journey, and one must be patient who follows him—although Doctor Flew himself must have been infinitely more patient in making a journey that was largely untracked. From the New Testament to Ritschl he takes us, supporting with chapter and verse every significant statement, and showing on every page an astonishing command of the literature. Withal he has the courage of criticism. He is quick to detect departures from the true ideal—those departures which too often have made the doctrine of perfection a byword.

In a final chapter, Doctor Flew states his conclusions, and for this chapter the reader will be grateful. He finds that the primary and determinative principles are two: first, that the full Christian ideal must span both worlds, the present life and the life to come; second, that the Christian life is the gift of God. As to the content of the ideal, he finds that it is perpetually expansive, that it is inclusive of all good things, that it sees the daily tasks as divine vocation, that it requires spiritual tribute to be taken from each passing moment, and that the sense of personal unworthiness shall be always present. But because the Christian ideal is intended both for this world and the next, there is necessarily a tension: the relative values of the earthly life must continually give way to the absolute values of the life beyond. "In a word, the Cross is an integral element in the ideal life in this world."

The form of the book befits the con-

tents, as one would expect from the Oxford Press.

EDWIN LEWIS.

Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion in the Theological Seminary of Drew University.

The Trail of Life in the Middle Years. By RUFUS M. JONES. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.00.

THIS is the story of the pilgrimage of a "mildly mystical mind" through the middle years of life, that is, the period between thirty and fifty. In the life of Doctor Jones this period corresponded with the years 1894 to 1914. During this time he was professor of philosophy in Haverford College, Philadelphia, and editor of the *American Friend*. When the period began the vast majority of the readers of the *American Friend*, as well as of Christians in America, held the generally accepted orthodox position which Doctor Jones summarizes under these five points. First, the transcendence of God. Second, the world created at a specific time by a specific creative act. Third, the Bible an infallible and authoritative revelation. Fourth, the utter ruin of man by the Fall. Fifth, "The Plan of Salvation." These were the nucleus of Calvinistic Theology. In short, the Old Master of Geneva gave form to the whole orthodox conception of Christianity, and to this day our theology seems to be merely a restatement of his views, or the elaboration of a few specific differences from Calvin's formulations.

This complacent orthodoxy met during the "Middle Years" first, the assault that arose in the historical criticism of the Bible. Next, the bewildering expansion of science that included every sphere of human conduct and action, even embracing the intimate experiences

of religion. Third, the rise of social criticism that challenged every former theory of government and economics invading the sphere of religion as the so-called "Social Gospel."

Beginning with a careful study of what was essential in the Quaker position, Doctor Jones shows how one man's faith not only held its own but expanded in the midst of this revolution that was changing the whole face of civilization.

The particular method of this process may not be highly original, but the expression of it is, as well as the depth of spiritual insight, which is a worthy expression of the mystical movement inaugurated by George Fox, at its very best.

There were more practical battles that Doctor Jones had to fight than those of the changing intellectual and social world. He had to maintain the interest of his subscribers in his paper while he led them forward through the confusion of the new thought. He also had to meet the succeeding classes of students in his little college with an interpretation of life broad enough to include an ethical, mystical religion. He had also to contend with bodily ills, rheumatism, "hay fever" and the trouble which helped make Carlyle famous, indigestion.

Every preacher will enjoy the fine statement of his method of preparing for public address. The preacher who can make himself master of this method will be able to "speak to the condition" of this chaotic day.

There is in the whole book a quiet but effective humor, as when he tells the story of the old Friend, disturbed by historical criticism of the Bible, and rising to deliver a message in his home meeting, which he illustrated by this incident: "I knew a young man who became instilled with doubts and even disbelieved that Jonah was actually swallowed by

a great fish. Well, this young man invited a friend to go out with him in a sailboat. There came up a sudden squall and the young man who doubted was drowned." After sitting uneasily for a little while, this sensitive old Friend rose again and said, "Friends, for the honor of truth, I think I ought to say that the other young man was drowned also." For next to a living faith, the essential thing for life is a sense of humor.

As you might expect, Doctor Jones' book is wholesome, human, interesting, penetrating in its insight and will carry any man who reads it along life's way to the eternal springs that are forever refreshing the weary souls of the wayfarers who are fortunate enough to find them. For Doctor Jones, the noble prayer of the Prayer Book is answered: "Grant, O God, that we may so pass through things temporal that we may finally not lose things eternal." But the word "finally" was not originally in the prayer. Doctor Jones has found the eternal not at the end of the temporal, but in the midst of it.

EDMUND JANES KULP.

Grand Avenue Temple,
Kansas City, Missouri.

We Have An Altar. By CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.00.

THIS is a book which will be helpful to many ministers who do not ordinarily read books of sermons, and to many laymen who have never discovered the possibilities of spiritual renewal in the communion service.

Dr. Craig points out that the central element in the worship of the early Christian Church was the Eucharist. Controversies over its significance at the time of the Reformation produced a confusion with regard to the

Lord's Supper from which the Protestant Church has never completely emerged. Dr. Craig believes that the communion table should be restored to its central place in the life of the Church. He maintains that true worship brings empowerment for the fulfillment of the ethical tasks of religion, so pressing in this era. He is not concerned with a return to ritualism, but he is impressed with the value of historic forms of worship which express the religious experience of the race, carrying the individual out into a broader stream than his own narrow creek. He sees a peril in symbols which are not made meaningful to the people by a teaching ministry, and he holds that meditations on the mysteries of the faith are nowhere as fitting as at the observance of the sacrament of the Supper. The addresses which are contained in this volume are ample proof of the validity of his thesis. As to the greatness of the themes which he discusses, the topics of the meditations speak for themselves: "A Purpose for Existence," "He Who Is Faithful," "The Remission of Sins," "The Silent Hour," "The Heroic Temper," etc.

As a professor of the New Testament, Dr. Craig has a rich historical background at his command, and throughout these addresses he brings his scholarship effectively to the aid of the faith. He also has a gift with which theological professors are not always endowed—the ability to clothe his thought in vivid, human terms, sometimes epigrammatic and always gripping. "Pork and poker, beef and bridge, mutton and movies are not sufficient to grow a healthy soul," is not the language of a cloistered theologian remote from life. "I want to say in all earnestness, 'No architect can put an altar in any church.' Only a worshiping minister leading a worshiping congregation can erect an al-

tar in the house of God" is the language not of barren theory but of living reality. That is characteristic of this whole book.

The volume closes with "A Liturgy for Our Day," an order for the communion service in which Dr. Craig combines historic forms with free worship in a ritual which is characterized by sound psychology, literary beauty, and spiritual helpfulness.

MORGAN P. NOYES.

Central Presbyterian Church,
Montclair, New Jersey.

Arabia and the Bible. By JAMES A. MONTGOMERY. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. \$2.00.

THIS is a decidedly useful book. It is symptomatic of a new trend in the exegesis of the Old Testament, and employs a line of approach that is likely to be fertile in results. We have listened for long to scholars saying Lo here! and lo, there! as they turned to Babylonian and Egypt in earnest endeavors to explicate the Old Testament records, and while, doubtless, the Hebrews borrowed much from these quarters the main part of their heritage comes from Arabia, the original home of the Semites.

This work was requiring to be done, not only as a corrective to certain partial views but also to set forth the splendor of the native Semitic genius. Professor Montgomery has set forth here the available material in an interesting fashion and has shed light on a good many dark parts of scripture. Great credit is due to the hardy explorers who, at much personal risk, have penetrated this unknown land, for Arabia is really "a dark continent" and research is attended with unusual dangers owing to the fanaticism of the desert tribes. We are just at the beginning of things here compared to our advanced knowledge of Assyria and

Babylonia. But it is here, we feel, the key to the interpretation of the Old Testament is found and the exegete may wait with expectation for more light from Arabia.

The book consists of lectures delivered on the Haskell Foundation at Oberlin, and is written to interest not only the technical scholar but also the educated layman. The references to Arabs and Arabia in the Bible are all carefully documented, while a chapter on Arabian Deserts affords scope for large discussion of the problem of change in Arabia. "Araby the Blest," another chapter, sheds light on the Yemen, whose large commercial relations and mercantile expansion are illustrated from scripture and history. The relations of Arabia with the history and culture of Palestine are finally set forth, and the writer draws the conclusion "that not from the wisdom of the Egyptian, Babylonian and Greek civilizations came our western religions, but out of Arabia."

Two cover maps and a complete index make this a worthy volume.
Drew University. JOHN PATERSON.

John R. Mott—World Citizen. By BASIL MATHEWS. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$3.00.

I REGARD *John R. Mott—World Citizen* as one of the four or five major books which every minister, thoughtful Christian layman, college president and faculty member and all others related to the World Mission of Christianity should read. This life story will, without doubt, find its place among the great American biographies.

The book is the life story of a great man, who not only had the inheritance and early training which mark the unusual man, but one who, in a real sense, achieved greatness. I use this term "greatness" as signifying a life that has

touched as many significant, dynamic and creative movements and personalities as is to be found in the present-day world.

The book is also an authentic history of the major movements in Christianity in the last forty years. After tracing the boyhood and school life events, the author deliberately departed from the usual biographical method, and chose, without regard to chronological order in the life story, to trace the history of the great movements with which Doctor Mott was connected. This means that no one who pretends to understand what is going on in the Christian world to-day can afford to be without this background historical material.

As Doctor Mott, himself, as the author portrays vividly if not romantically, had the extraordinary power of calling out leaders for various enterprises, either associating them with himself and his enterprises or setting them going in great movements of their own, so this biography may have the same effect on a greatly increased group who would take the time to ponder these pages. Mr. Mathews has done this so excellently that the reading of the life story should itself call forth and send into new fields of labor many potential leaders and workers now waiting for that intimate touch to help them to spring into life. In this regard, students of colleges, universities and theological schools would do well to become acquainted with the dynamic personality portrayed in these 450 pages.

There is much also of very practical value in this biography. How to divide one's time during the day or months or over a year so that major objectives will be accomplished and minor things will not eat up the hours; how to plan and set up a conference, in order that it should arrive at its objective; how to preside over a meeting especially in dis-

cussion so as to steer toward the goals and keep out irrelevant questions and remarks; how to arrange the details of a meeting such as seating, ventilation and ushering so that all will contribute to the highest intellectual and spiritual ends; how to use leisure time; how to take a vacation; how to throw responsibility upon subordinates, especially upon young men to draw the best out of them—these and a dozen other characteristics are so vividly portrayed by Mr. Mathews as to make this biography almost a manual in Christian leadership.

To all those who know him intimately or who are related to him officially, one of the most remarkable things revealed in the onward sweep of his life is his openmindedness, his willingness to think and act in advance of each new age and his tremendous power to challenge men to think, plan work and live mindful of the new creative forces that are pressing in from every side. Many thought that John R. Mott would emerge from the World War into an inevitable period of disillusionment, cynicism, reaction and depression as one who had spent his force and who was now willing to retire. But not so, the post-war period has found him even more alert and more alive, which qualities Mr. Mathews has shown quite forcibly.

Those who are more or less acquainted with the facts connected with the historic movements with which Doctor Mott has been related have missed the usual biographical method of letting a great personality grow and develop in front of you, making the interplay of circumstance and historical events with personal qualities show the full-orbed man. While a little disappointed at first in not finding this in the last half of this biography, the author, probably with Doctor Mott's consent, decided to take the course indicated,

There are some significant gaps in this life story. One would wish for more details concerning Doctor Mott's diplomatic and other secular missions and the whole story of his relation to the World War. We miss also the inside story of Doctor Mott's relation to the Interchurch World Movement and to the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry, which was inspired by one of his addresses to a group of Baptist laymen and which he had hoped would be the beginning of another great laymen's movement on behalf of the World Mission of Christianity. These and other omissions as well as the fruitful years which lie just ahead, lead one to feel that the complete biography of Dr. John R. Mott is still to be written.

No more facile and able writer than Basil Mathews could be found for this exacting task. Mr. Mathews was well prepared by study, experience, travel and long connection with many of the movements to which Doctor Mott was related. He is, as well, a gifted writer.

RALPH E. DIFFENDORFER.

Board of Foreign Missions
of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

A Primer for Tomorrow. By CHRISTIAN GAUSS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.50.

Here is a book which is refreshing and stimulating. It is different. So many interpretations of the present situation by economists and political scientists lack historical perspective. Not a few are deliberately doctrinaire. Who among us is not weary of the man who has a cherished economic thesis to defend or a favorite panacea to offer a bewildered people?

Not Dean Gauss. In *A Primer For Tomorrow* a Professor of Modern Languages, Dean of the College in Prince-

ton University, looks at the changing social scene. There is in his book a serene urbanity which is always the mark of scholarly detachment. He is not trying to make converts. He has no political, social or economic axe to grind. He offers a rapid survey of the social movement as it finds expression in nationalism, in capitalism, and in science and then seems to say—"Here are the facts. Here are certain historic trends. Formulate your own opinion."

The book is refreshing because it does not follow the beaten track. It breaks a new trail in the wilderness of social interpretation. There is an obvious awareness of the gravity of the present crisis but no surrender to pessimism. No matter what may have happened to Rome or to Greece or to any ancient civilization, as long as men are creative, civilization endures. "A civilization like the Roman, or our own, does not die because of hostile force applied from without, so much as from a weakening of the stimulus, that inner spring which once released energies and directed them toward a common goal."

Nationalism is doomed because of the deep, underlying cultural unities which bind together Germany, France, England and the United States. Not one of these nations can live alone. Any attempt to set up economic self-sufficiency must end in Fascism and after that in revolt. The sources of culture, in any of the Western nations, lie beyond the frontiers, and, in the long last, this cultural affinity will win against national separatism.

The chapters on "The Rise of Capitalism" and "The Disintegration of Capitalism" are invaluable to the student of modern tendencies. Many of us who have not the patience to work through the volumes of Tawney, Troeltsch and Weber will find here all that we need. The story is told in simple, non-technical

language so that any one untrained in this field may understand why capitalism may cease to dominate the social structure without recourse to either Fascism or Communism.

Dean Gauss develops one symptom of social revolution in elaborate detail. "For forty years at least, the dominant movement in literature has been away from the life of our times." This alienation of the intellectuals, this transfer of allegiance, this eagerness to criticize the existing order—is always a sign of revolutionary changes. Revolutions usually occur when the gap between government and society becomes too wide. That is our peril at this moment, and the one issue is whether the social revolution may be achieved by violent or by non-violent means.

Dean Gauss frankly admits that the suggestion that the only hope of saving culture lies in religion will "elicit a smile of incredulity and perhaps of scorn." But to that point he leads us in this book. Science may modify the conditions of life, but science cannot save culture or civilization. The one great ultimate struggle is in the inner spirit of man—and this is the arena of faith. "We must eternalize our own God-given day by building into it abiding human values."

He leaves the matter there. He does not prophesy. He is honestly concerned because of what he calls "the decline of

religion." One by one the great domains of life have passed from the church to the state. There seems to be no place to put religion. "It is like having to move a concert grand piano into an eight-by-ten New York apartment. We must move out to get in. A religion which has been excluded from politics, from business, from science, and from public education, from all those fields which mean most to modern man, has naturally lost power and influence."

Where Dean Gauss ends, the minister of religion begins. He takes heart as he finds his field delimited. His business is not to draw the blue prints of the new social order, but to inspire men and women to take religion back into business and science and education and politics. Not as in the day of the medieval church, but in terms of motivation and idealism and vision. That is why the book is so stimulating. It is—essentially and literally—a *primer* for tomorrow. It does not indicate the next step ahead but it inspires one to find the way for himself. One may not find this book in the average bibliography of homiletics, but few books are more helpful in opening sermon doors. Put it on the shelf beside George Soule's *The Coming American Revolution*—and one has resource material of the richest sort.

MCILYAR H. LICHLITER
First Congregational Church,
Columbus, Ohio.

Bookish Brevities

In his *Creative Men* Bishop William F. McDowell emphasizes and re-emphasizes the thought that God will not ask what kind of ministers men have been, but what kind they have resolutely and even desperately tried to be. It is timely encouragement, now that many ministers are sorely beset by untoward social and industrial conditions. A few unusually gifted or favorably located believe that the situation provides the most receptive opportunity. Others face dwindling and indifferent congregations, notwithstanding their earnest efforts. The editors have had this in mind in choosing the contents of this issue of RELIGION IN LIFE.

Worthwhile books are not born of mediocre minds and meager souls. Books are often supposed to be destitute of meaning and difficult to read because of a confused style, when the primary trouble is confused thinking. Clear thinking and clear writing are likely to be mated. Robert Louis Stevenson used to say: "The difficulty of literature is not to write but to write what you mean: not to affect your reader, but to affect your reader precisely as you wish."

Dr. A. E. Garvie, who is a graduate of Oxford, a Doctor of Divinity of Glasgow, a Doctor of Theology of Berlin, and the author of *Can Christ Save Society?* received this summer the Doctorate of Divinity of London University.

It is being told that on a visit to a country old folks' home a minister's wife was presented to a resident who had

a reputation for liking poetry. An offer to bring her a book or two of verse elicited the reply that when she wanted poetry, she made it. She produced this specimen:

When you are discouraged
Don't let your courage fade,
When you get a lemon
Just make some lemonade.

At the annual meeting of the English Presbyterian Assembly, Principal John Oman of Westminster College, Cambridge, declared he measured every prospective student by two standards: "Is he a man of weight, a man of moral caliber, which tells in the long run as nothing else does? Has he a sound education in English, so that he knows a good book from a bad? You can do anything with a youth who has these equipments, and you can do nothing without them."

C. F. Andrews, author of *What I Owe to Christ* and *Christ in the Silence*, is in South Africa, where he is securing help from the Indians resident there for those in their homeland who have suffered from floods and earthquakes. From South Africa he proceeds to Palestine, where he has been invited to counsel with the Arabs in the tensions between them and the Zionist Jews.

The publication of the enormous totals of the sales of popular American books in former years is accompanied by the admission that back lists have shown a steady decline in sales for more than a decade. There has been, however, a

compensating increase in the sales of current books, non-fiction as well as fiction.

.

The Cardinal Hayes Literature Committee makes for Roman Catholics a white list of books selected quarterly. The committee bases its selections upon three qualifications. The book must be worthy of a mature intelligence. It must not offend the Christian sense of truth or decency. It must bear the marks of good literary craftsmanship.

.

Since the masses of Russia have been taught to read, their hunger for books is unappeasable. In the Soviet publishing houses the average printing for a new novel is 10,000 copies and for technical books the printings sometimes run as high as 100,000 copies. Lenin's writings are printed a half million at a time. The supply of books falls far short of the demand, but scarcity of paper constitutes an insuperable limitation.

.

Professor Atwood H. Townsend of New York University is the chairman of a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English, which has made a survey of the books recommended for reading in college courses.

In the "recent book" classification, Bennett's *Old Wives' Tale* is the most frequently recommended. Strachey's *Queen Victoria*, Conrad's *Lord Jim*, Hudson's *Far Away and Long Ago*, Wharton's *Ethan Frome*, Cather's *My Antonia*, and Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga* are required reading in many colleges.

Among the books of the period before this, Hardy's *Return of the Native*, and Thackeray's *Henry Esmond* are most widely recommended. George Eliot is also given general recognition.

Strachey's *Eminent Victorians*, Emerson's *Essays*, Lamb's *Essays*, *The Edu-*

cation of Henry Adams, and Garland's *Son of the Middle Border* are favorite requirements.

.

The fifty-sixth Annual Conference of the American Library Association, which met in Montreal in June, discussed the serious shortage of books existing in public libraries everywhere, due to increased demand and decreased income during the last four years. Former book stocks were reported to be worn out, and new books cannot be purchased. Thus, the library has lost some of its ability to keep its readers in touch with current developments and is not now rendering its full contribution to national recovery. Appropriating bodies were urged to provide more adequate funds for books, though not at the expense of personnel, equally necessary for effective service.

It was agreed to favor five hundred library systems, serving one hundred per cent of the people of the United States, instead of the present ten thousand libraries serving sixty per cent of the population.

Stanley Jones' *Christ and Human Suffering* was recognized as the most popular religious book of the year.

.

Concerning the Bible, by Conrad A. Skinner, author of *Importunate Questions*, is being adopted as a textbook by many colleges and high schools. In it he quotes excerpts of quaintly proverbial flavor which show the Talmud at its best.

"He who marries for money, his children shall be a curse to him."

"The house that does not open to the poor shall open to the physician."

"Teach thy tongue to say, 'I do not know.'"

"If there be anything bad to say of you, say it yourself."

"Commit a sin twice and you will think it quite allowable."

"Jerusalem was destroyed because the instruction of the young was neglected."

"The world is saved by the breath of the school children. Even for the rebuilding of the Temple, schools must not be interrupted."

In 1768 Dr. Edward Harwood published a *Liberal Translation of the New Testament*. He held that the bald and barbarous language of the old vulgar version (the King James) would never be read by persons of a liberal education and polite taste. He believed that if he diffused over the sacred page the elegance of modern English, refined and polished, youth might be allured to read a volume they neglected and disregarded, as containing too little to amuse and delight.

Harwood's book, which emphasized words rather than ideas, is long since forgotten. Teachers of literature have insisted upon the persistent reading of the King James Version for its formative influence in the making of a style of directness, simplicity and force.

Alfred Noyes, in his new book, *The Unknown God*, contributes to this insistence—"The noblest measure in the English language, the measure into which its finest utterances have fallen as though in accordance with a natural law, is the measure in which Milton wrote his epics, and Shakespeare wrote the greater part of his dramatic works. The greatest line of Shakespeare in that measure is perhaps the line in Hamlet,

'Absent thee from felicity awhile.'

It is merely an accident, from the human point of view, though perhaps in the eternal aspect a breath of inspiration, that an obscure translator, in the age of Shakespeare, should have written, not only the greatest single line in Shakespeare's own measure, but a single line that in itself outweighs all the wonders

of his combined works, and compresses more meaning into its ten syllables. 'I am the Resurrection and the Life.'

By a well-sustained popular verdict the three finest poems of Wordsworth are *Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey*, the *Immortality Ode*, and the *Ode to Duty*. The two odes, with some fifty other poems, appeared in the diminutive volumes of 1807—reckoned to-day among the great treasures of literature. Yet the review of these volumes by Francis Jeffrey was of a blighting character. Of the *Ode to Duty*, the best he could say was that it is a poem "in which the lofty vein is very unsuccessfully attempted." The famous lines,

Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;
And the most ancient heavens, through Thee,
are fresh and strong,

he dismissed as "utterly without meaning." As for the *Immortality Ode*, the editor of the *Edinburgh Review* did not consider it worthy of the slightest mention. In the *Annual Review and History of Literature* for 1807 there was a long article dealing with Wordsworth's "Two Volumes of 1807," in which the editor alluded to the *Ode to Duty* as "a meanly written piece, with some good thoughts."

Such was the trend of contemporary criticism. Eighty years later, James Russell Lowell, at the time American ambassador to Great Britain, characterized the same poem as "The incomparable Ode."

So writes Dr. Cornelius H. Patton of Hartford, Connecticut, one of the most ardent and accomplished Wordsworthian scholars in America.

From the time of its organization,

Dr. John Baillie of Union Theological Seminary has been a faithful, painstaking and highly efficient member of the Editorial Board of *RELIGION IN LIFE*. A few months ago he accepted the Chair of Divinity at Edinburgh University, his Alma Mater, and enters upon his duties on October 1.

This chair is often spoken of as the most influential in the theological world. Among the famous predecessors of Doctor Baillie are Thomas Chalmers, Robert Flint and W. P. Paterson.

An interesting coincidence is that his

brother, Dr. Donald M. Baillie, has been appointed to a professorship at Saint Andrew's University and will also begin his duties on October 1. In that chair he follows the famous Dr. George Galloway.

Doctor Baillie will continue upon the Editorial Board of *RELIGION IN LIFE*. He will seek to secure suitable articles from British scholars. If his new responsibilities permit, he is to write from time to time comprehensive reviews of new books on religious subjects.

INDEX—VOLUME III

A

- Adventures in Altruism: *French*, 57.
 Atkins: Whither Liberalism? 330.
 Asey: Religion versus Superstition, 559.

B

- Baillie*: The Office of the Ministry, 483.
Berg: Gardening for Experience, 454.
Branscomb: The Church and the Modern Mind, The: *Slosser*, 134.
Brown, Arthur Judson: Immortality of the Unfit, 110.
Brown, William Adams: Rethinking Ministerial Education, 379.
 By What Authority? *Courtis*, 402.
 (Article I in Two Views of Religious Education.)

C

- Calkins*: Mysticism and Preaching in the Modern World, 174.
 Can Christ Save Society? *Oznam*, 291.
 Catholic Church and the Modern Mind, The: *Slosser*, 134.
 Christian Cult of Violence, The: *Davis*, 432.
 (With Comment by *Reinhold Niebuhr*.)
 Christian Experience in a Science-Dominated World: *Woodburne*, 383.
 Christian Manifesto, A: *McConnell*, 614.
 Christianity and Nationalism: *Tittle*, 189.
 Church and Education for the Family, The: *Wood*, 420.
 Church and the Social Crisis, The: *Branscomb*, 257.
 Climate of Religion, The: *Roll*, 245.
 Comment on The Christian Cult of Violence: *Niebuhr*, 439.
 Courtis: By What Authority? 402.
 (Article I in Two Views of Religious Education.)
 Craig: The Dilemma of Religion in the Economic Order, 199.

D

- Davis*: The Christian Cult of Violence, 432.
 (With Comment by *Reinhold Niebuhr*.)
 Day: The Significance of Jesus Christ for the Modern World, 286.
 Devotional Life of the Minister, The: *Sherrill*, 87.
 Dilemma in Modern Preaching, The: *Fern*, 550.
 Dilemma of Religion in the Economic Order, The: *Craig*, 199.

E

- End of Our Time, The: *Mackay*, 468.

F

- Fern*: The Dilemma in Modern Preaching, 550.
Finch: God's Face at the Window—William Blake, 281.
 For the Honor of the Church: *Stamm*, 599.
 Form Criticism: A New Method of Research: *Grant*, 351.
Fosbroke: Prayer and Poetry, 212.
French: Adventures in Altruism, 57.
 Function of Criticism in Literature, The: *Grammer*, 442.
 Functions of Counseling, The: *Trout*, 75.

G

- Game of Science, The: *Taylor*, 567.
 Gardening for Experience: *Berg*, 454.
Gealy: Shadow-Pictures from Japan, 507.
 God's Face at the Window—William Blake: *Finch*, 281.
Grammer: The Function of Criticism in Literature, 442.
Grant: Form Criticism: A New Method of Research, 351.

H

- Hecker*: The Soviets Look at Uncle Sam, 588.
 Holy Ghost in Mystical Experience, The: *Hoyle*, 342.
Hornighausen: The Preaching of Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen, 231.
 Honest Religion: *Oman*, 3.
Horne: Religion, Democracy and the Changing Social Order, 530.
Hough: Thinking in a Shaking World, 542.
Hoyle: The Holy Ghost in Mystical Experience, 342.

I

- Immortality of the Unfit: *Arthur Judson Brown*, 110.
 Inner Life and Social Effectiveness, The: *Van Dusen*, 24.
 Institution or Movement? *Stafford*, 579.
 Is Worship an Escape? *Pickett*, 38.

J

- Jones*: Religion: A Mutual and Reciprocal Correspondence Between God and Man, 13.

L

- Look at the World, A: *Norwood*, 609.
Lyman: Theology and the New Order, 220.

M

- McCammon*: Modern Youth and Religion, 409.
 (Article II in Two Views of Religious Education.)
McConnell: A Christian Manifesto, 614.
McDowell: To-day's Challenge to the Christian Church, 517.
Mackay: The End of Our Time, 468.
Meek: Translation Difficulties in the Old Testament, 491.
 Modern Youth and Religion: *McCammon*, 409.
 (Article II in Two Views of Religious Education.)
Moldenhauer: On Books and Preaching, 124.
 Mysticism and Preaching in the Modern World: *Calkins*, 174.

N

- Newton*: The Reply of the Preacher, 555.
Niebuhr: Comment on The Christian Cult of Violence, 439.
Nixon: The Social Task of Christianity, 47.
Norwood: A Look at the World, 609.

O

- Office of the Ministry, The: *Baillie*, 483.
Oman: Honest Religion, 3.
 On Books and Preaching: *Moldenhauer*, 124.
 Our Christian Morality: *Whitchurch*, 367.
Oznam: Can Christ Save Society? 291.

P

- Park*: What My Religion Means to Me, 323.
Paterson: Prophecy and Asceticism, 209.
Pickett: Is Worship an Escape? 38.
 Prayer and Poetry: *Fosbroke*, 212.
 Preaching of Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen, The: *Hornighausen*, 231.
 Prophecy and Asceticism: *Paterson*, 209.

R

- Roll*: The Climate of Religion, 245.
 Religion: A Mutual and Reciprocal Correspondence Between God and Man: *Jones*, 13.
 Religion, Democracy and the Changing Social Order: *Horne*, 530.
 Religion versus Superstition: *Asey*, 559.
 Religious Quest Continues to be Central, The: *Richter*, 67.
 Religious Situation in Germany To-day, The: *TWitch*, 163.
 Reply of the Preacher, The: *Newton*, 555.
 Rethinking Ministerial Education: *William Adams Brown*, 379.
Richter: The Religious Quest Continues to be Central, 67.
Roberts: Some Aspects of Contemporary Japan, 275.

S

- Shadow-Pictures from Japan: *Gealy*, 507.
Sherrill: The Devotional Life of the Minister, 87.
 Significance of Jesus Christ for the Modern World, The: *Day*, 266.
Slosser: The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind, 134.
 Social Task of Christianity, The: *Nixon*, 47.
 Some Aspects of Contemporary Japan: *Roberts*, 275.
 Soviets Look at Uncle Sam, The: *Hecker*, 588.
Stafford: Institution or Movement? 579.
Stamm: For the Honor of the Church, 599.

T

- Taylor*: The Game of Science, 567.
 Theology and the New Order: *Lyman*, 220.
 Thinking in a Shaking World: *Hough*, 542.
Tillich: The Religious Situation in Germany To-day, 163.
Tittle: Christianity and Nationalism, 189.
 To the Tune of Hursley: *Zelie*, 100.
 To-day's Challenge to the Christian Church: *McDowell*, 517.
 Translation Difficulties in the Old Testament: *Meek*, 491.

Trout: The Functions of Counseling, 75.

Two Views of Religious Education:

- I. By What Authority? *Courtis*, 402.
- II. Modern Youth and Religion: *McCammon*, 409.

V

Van Dusen: The Inner Life and Social Effectiveness, 24.

W

- What My Religion Means to Me: *Perk*, 323.
Whitchurch: Our Christian Morality, 367.
 Whither Liberalism? *Atkins*, 330.
Wood: The Church and Education for the Family, 420.
Woodburne: Christian Experience in a Science-Dominated World, 393.

Z

Zelie: To the Tune of Hursley, 100.

Book Reviews, 139, 295, 470, 619.

Bookish Brevities, 158, 318, 478, 635.

